

1716. By Mr. WALTER: Resolution of parish of Christ Church, Philadelphia, with regard to the UNO, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1717. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Townsend Clubs of the Fifth Congressional District of the State of Florida, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to support of House bills 2229 and 2230; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1718. Also, petition of various citizens of Stratton, Colo., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the admittance to this country of the English wife of Sgt. Salvador Velasquez; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1719. Also, petition of Southern Hardwood Producers, Inc., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request to increase southern hardwood and cypress prices 20 percent; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1720. Also, petition of the Wisconsin League of Radio Stations, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Lea bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 20, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Chaplain Maj. Paul W. Yinger, AUS, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who art the strength of those who seek Thee, the joy of those who love Thee, we who are Thy creatures ask Thy wisdom and leading, without which our days are aimless and our strivings mean and momentary.

O Thou who art the Teacher of the meek, speak to us the word of truth that we be not condemned to move from error to despair and from despair to defeat.

Bless our land, we pray, with the fruits of honest toil and the blessings which come from devotion to Thy way. Fashion us into a courageous and noble people that we may prove ourselves the encouragement and hope of the world. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, March 19, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4873) to create an Agricultural Credit Agency, to consolidate therein all Federal agricultural lending agencies, to create a public farm-appraisal system, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on March 19, 1946, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 398. An act providing for the transfer of a certain fish hatchery in Comanche County, Okla., to the city of Lawton, Okla.; S. 1162. An act to convey certain lands to the State of Wyoming; and

S. 1185. An act to change the designation of Custer Battlefield National Cemetery, in the State of Montana, to Custer Battlefield National Monument, and for other purposes.

COMMENDATION OF COMMODORE JAMES K. VARDAMAN—RESOLUTION OF MISSISSIPPI LEGISLATURE

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Mississippi commending the Honorable James K. Vardaman, whose nomination as a member of the Federal Reserve Board is now before the Senate. I ask to have the resolution printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 31

Concurrent resolution memorializing the United States Senate to confirm the appointment of James K. Vardaman as a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System

Whereas James K. Vardaman is a native-born Mississippian and a member of one of Mississippi's most illustrious families, his father, James K. Vardaman, Sr., having served as a member of the legislature, speaker of the house of representatives, Governor of Mississippi, and a United States Senator; and

Whereas James K. Vardaman has an excellent educational background, having graduated from the University of Mississippi with both a bachelor of arts degree and a bachelor of laws degree; and

Whereas he has had a long and wide experience in the handling of bonds, finance, and banking; and

Whereas James K. Vardaman has served his country bravely and courageously as a captain of artillery in World War I and as a commander, captain, and commodore in the United States Navy in World War II, and was wounded in the invasion of southern Europe; and

Whereas the President of the United States has appointed Commodore Vardaman as a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System because of his qualifications as a banker and because of his wide experience in finance and bonds: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi (the senate concurring therein), That the United States Senate be memorialized to confirm the appointment of James K. Vardaman as a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the clerk of the United States Senate and to the two Senators from the State of Mississippi.

Adopted by the house of representatives, February 27, 1946.

J. WALTER SILLUS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
Adopted by the senate, March 5, 1946.

F. L. WRIGHT,
President of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT—PETITION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have in my hand a telegram signed by outstanding businessmen of my home town of Topeka, Kans., urgently appealing to the Congress to indicate definitely in the pending bill (S. 1349) to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes, that employees of any office building which is not engaged in interstate commerce be exempt from the wage-hour provisions. I earnestly hope such action will be taken by the Senate when that section of the bill is reached.

I ask unanimous consent to present the telegram and that it be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was received, ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOPEKA, KANS., March 15, 1946.

HON. ARTHUR A. CAPPER,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We the undersigned in conference just concluded are unanimously agreed that wage-hour amendment, S. 1349, would extend provisions of wage-hour law to practically all office buildings. Only those buildings engaged in interstate commerce are now covered by law. Proposed legislation would bring under law every activity affecting commerce. Proposed changes would create confusion. Proposed changes should possibly remove all distinction between interstate and intrastate business and we urge your vigorous opposition.

Paul Sweet, David Neiswanger, Laird Dean, Wm. O. Biby, David G. Page, H. O. Chapman, J. E. Merriam, C. O. Blevans, W. L. Hamilton, John Dean, Henry Bubb.

USE OF WORDS "OBSERVE SUNDAY" IN CANCELLATION OF MAIL

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD without the signatures attached a letter signed by the Reverend Robert I. Scott, pastor, and 65 members of the United Presbyterian Church, of Chicopee, Mass., in which they endorse Senate Joint Resolution 46 to provide for use of the words "Observe Sunday" in the cancellation of United States mail.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD without the signatures attached, as follows:

CHICOPEE, MASS., March 7, 1946.

DEAR SIR: We are more than happy for the Christian stand that you have shown in the introduction of the Senate Joint Resolution 46 and desire to add our testimony to yours.

Even the quiet printing of "Observe Sunday" on the mail, especially at the strategic season of the year that you propose, shall speak much for the preservation of a day that should be marked with the thanksgiving and prayers of a so-called Christian nation.

We appreciate this and all similar efforts and in token thereof have affixed our names as fellow citizens and fellow Christians and we shall watch and pray for the enactment of this bill.

Sincerely,
THE MINISTER AND MEMBERS.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 1871. A bill to authorize the conveyance of a parcel of land at the naval supply depot, Bayonne, N. J., to the American Radiator & Standard Sanitary Corp.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1070); and

H. J. Res. 307. Joint resolution to authorize the use of naval vessels to determine the effect of atomic weapons upon such vessels; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1071).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1967. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the complete independence of the Philippine Islands, to provide for the adoption of a constitution and a form of government for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," as amended; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 1938. A bill for the relief of Ida Valeri; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 1969. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Andrew Evans; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1970. A bill to amend certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 1971. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of certain materials to the United States Coast Guard Auxiliary; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. MEAD introduced Senate bill 1972, to repeal the prohibition against the filling of a vacancy in the office of district judge in the Southern District of New York, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges, at its recent session which was held in September 1945, recommended the repeal of the prohibition against filling the judicial vacancy in the District Court of the Southern District of New York. That vacancy was caused by the retirement of the late Judge John M. Woolsey. The effect of this action would be to restore to 13 the number of district court judges authorized for the southern district of New York. The thirteenth judge was authorized by the act of May 24, 1940, but that act contained a provision to the effect that thereafter the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge should not be filled. Consequently, the number of judges reverted to 12 upon the retirement last December 31 of Judge Woolsey.

Mr. President, I therefore ask unanimous consent to introduced for appropriate reference a bill to repeal the provision which prevents the filling of the vacancy in the southern district of New York which was caused by the retirement of Judge Woolsey.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1972) to repeal the prohibition against the filling of a vacancy in the office of district judge in the southern district of New York was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MEAD, and Mr. HOEY each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (S. 1349) to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1947—AMENDMENT

Mr. MYERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5605) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, which was in the item "Forest and range management investigations," on page 38, line 19, to strike out "\$2,330,000" and in lieu thereof to insert "\$2,405,000," which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4873) to create an Agricultural Credit Agency, to consolidate therein all Federal agricultural lending agencies, to create a public farm-appraisal system, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL BANKING LAWS

Mr. DOWNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 242), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to (1) the circumstances under which agencies of the Federal Government may grant or decline to grant banking charters or memberships in Federal agencies to banking institutions, or approve or disapprove the establishment of additional banking facilities by existing institutions, and (2) the administration of the Federal banking laws, particularly concerning the equal opportunity of banking institutions to share in the benefits of such laws, and whether discrimination and unfair practices are indulged by supervisory agencies to the prejudice of particular institutions. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable concerning additional legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and ad-

joined periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$—, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

PERMANENT APPOINTMENTS IN THE GRADES OF GENERAL OF THE ARMY, FLEET ADMIRAL OF THE NAVY, AND GENERAL IN THE MARINE CORPS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. THOMAS of Utah submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1354) to authorize the permanent appointment in the grades of General of the Army, Fleet Admiral of the United States Navy, and general in the Marine Corps, respectively, of certain individuals who have served in such grades during the Second World War, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the House recede from its amendment numbered 3.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1, 2, and 4, and the amendment of the House to the title of the bill; and agree to the same. Amendment numbered 5: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "shall be entitled to receive the same pay and allowances while on the retired list as officers appointed under this section are entitled to receive while on active duty."

"Sec. 3. The President is hereby authorized, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint to the permanent grade of admiral in the Coast Guard any individual who shall have served as Commandant of the Coast Guard, with the grade and rank of admiral, after March 21, 1945, and before August 14, 1945. Any officer appointed under the provisions of this section shall receive the pay and allowances prescribed by section 3 of the Act of March 21, 1945 (Public Law 20, Seventy-ninth Congress); and any such officer who has been or may hereafter be retired or relieved from active duty shall be entitled to have his name placed on the retired list with the highest grade or rank held by him on the active list or while on active duty, and shall be entitled to receive the same pay and allowances while on the retired list as officers appointed under this section are entitled to receive while on active duty"; and the House agree to the same.

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
LISTER HILL,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
STYLES BRIDGES,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

ANDREW J. MAY,
EWING THOMASON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
WALTER G. ANDREWS,
DEWEY SHORT,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

THE CPA—ARTICLE BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "What's Wrong with CPA?" written by him and published in the March 1946 issue of the Washington News Digest, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN POLITICAL PHILOSOPHIES—ADDRESS BY CHESTER V. SALOMON

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Chester V. Salomon, of Milwaukee, Wis., before Second Ward Republican Club of Milwaukee on March 14, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEED FOR FEDERAL LABOR LEGISLATION—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BALL

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Is Federal Labor Legislation Needed?" made by him on March 19, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

JACKSON DAY DINNER ADDRESS BY SENATOR MEAD

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Jackson Day dinner address delivered by him at Binghamton, N. Y., on March 18, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOOD SITUATION IN EUROPE—ARTICLE BY BISHOP SHELL

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the subject of the food situation in foreign countries written by Bishop Bernard J. Shell and published in the Washington Post of March 10, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

JEWISH HOMELAND IN PALESTINE—ADDRESS BY SOLICITOR GENERAL McGRATH

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of a Jewish homeland in Palestine, delivered by Solicitor General J. Howard McGrath on March 5, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BRITISH LOAN—STATEMENT BY EDWARD A. O'NEAL

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the statement in support of the British loan made by Edward A. O'Neal, president, American Farm Bureau Federation, before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on March 13, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM OF THE NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a national economic policy for agriculture adopted by the National Farmers Union, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPOINTMENT OF BERNARD M. BARUCH TO ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "New Assignment," from the Washington Evening Star of March 19, relating to the designation of Bernard M. Baruch as the American representative on the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. PEPPER obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Murray
Austin	Hart	Myers
Bailey	Hatch	O'Daniel
Ball	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Hayden	Overton
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Billbo	Hill	Radcliffe
Brewster	Hoey	Reed
Buck	Huffman	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Capper	Kilgore	Smith
Carville	Knowland	Stanfill
Chavez	La Follette	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McKellar	Tunnell
Eastland	McMahon	Tydings
Ellender	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Maybank	Walsh
Fulbright	Mead	Wheeler
George	Millikin	White
Gerry	Mitchell	Wiley
Gossett	Moore	Willis
Green	Morse	
Guffey	Murdock	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] is detained on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is recovering from a recent operation.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is still detained on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent because of the illness of a relative.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is absent because of illness in his family.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

AN AMERICAN POLICY FOR PEACE AND A NEW WORLD

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, as the hearts of men and nations are gripped in the fear of war, I rise to speak for peace, and against war, and alike against the causes of war and those who want to make war.

The grim danger of war which faces America and the world today impels me to speak with the utmost candor and plainness.

Before the veterans have all come home to their families again, before artificial legs and arms have been provided for the amputees, before new faces have been made for the scarred and wounded, be-

fore the sick and injured have all gotten into hospitals, and the handicapped have learned a new way of earning a living—yes, before the war itself is over, responsible people are letting their tongues roll the word "war" again.

It is time for the Government and the people of this country to stop, look, and listen. It is time—yes, it is late—for those millions of American men and women who have just laid down the weapons of war to awaken to the fact that we are hurtling toward war again. It is late for the mothers and fathers of this country who have just got some of their sons home, to be startled, and to realize that they are about to lose them again, and that the monster of war which they thought forever dead is rising once more.

What is this fright and furor which makes us so tense we can listen without surprise or shock at the rumor around the Halls of this Congress a few afternoons ago that demobilization had been stopped, leaves canceled, and feverish preparation for mobilization was in progress? There was such credibility in the very nature of this suggestion that the War Department had officially to deny it, even to the Congress.

Who is it that threatens us with war? Has Germany, so recently and so soundly defeated, suddenly reemerged as a potent enemy, ready to strike again?

Has Japan, after surrendering abjectly, eluded the vigilance of General MacArthur and his troops? Does she now stand ready again to plunge her treacherous dagger in our backs?

Have all our late enemies been suddenly resurrected from the grave dug by our victory only a few short months ago?

No. Germany, Japan, and their satellites are prostrate. It is not they who are the cause of these rumors of war.

Rather it is among the Allies who so gloriously fought together to defeat them, that, according to everything we see and hear, a new war threatens.

Here, for the first time in modern history, three major powers, all who fought grandly together as allies, stand unchallenged in the world. Their enemy is defeated, and no one save those whose hands they have clasped in the friendship of struggle and sacrifice are capable of threatening them. And yet we live in tension comparable to the days before Munich or on the eve of either of the last wars. Before we throw away this peace we have so dearly won, before we condemn mankind to war suicide, before we thrust back the hand of plenty which the future has hospitably been extending toward us and toward all mankind, is it not time to look with candor and clear sight, and with an earnestness which bespeaks the horror of what we risk if we fail, to try to understand what lies behind all this planning and talking about war.

Of course, there are always national chauvinism, imperial vanity, and the dangerous dregs of unrepentant isolationism loose in the land and in the world. And there is, of course, the infamous influence of fearmongers and warmongers who are promoting their gambles with death and destruction to

recapture their industrial or political empires which were destroyed in the defeat of nazism.

But beyond and behind these sinister forces and people, this tension which threatens war is the reflection of the desperate reaching out of the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union for national security.

Let us look at the Big Three, the victorious Big Three, today and see what they are doing for self-preservation.

Take ourselves first. The extent of demobilization we have had is primarily due to the demand of the men that they be let out and of their families and loved ones that they come home rather than to any desire on the part of the Army, Navy, or Air Forces. It has been recommended to the Congress that we have an Army of over a million, a Navy of 500,000; that we have over a thousand ships in active service and a reserve fleet subject to immediate manning—the largest Navy in the world beyond all question and essentially the equal of all other navies afloat.

It has been recommended that we have an Air Force of 500,000 men and the greatest and most modern air fleets, with the entire world in their range.

It has been recommended to the Congress that we extend selective service and that we adopt peacetime compulsory military training in America.

We are told that so many of our war plants will be stand-by plants ready for instant use in the making of war material, and that we shall stock pile from the ends of the earth strategic and critical materials.

Demand has been imperatively made that we gird ourselves with scores of major bases, stretching in the west to the coast of China 6,000 miles from San Francisco, reaching practically from the Arctic to the Antarctic, and including the mandated islands in the Marianas and the Carolines held by the Japanese under the League of Nations. And the same demand has been made for a system of bases that stretch the length of the hemisphere in the Atlantic.

Over and above all this, we have the atomic bomb. According to reports we are stock piling atomic bombs as fast as our facilities will allow, notwithstanding the growing resignations and resistance of the scientists who made the bomb possible.

We are on the verge of the most colossal experiment in military history to see what is the real strength and power and behavior of this atomic bomb, so that we may increase its destructive character, and at the same time build perhaps a new type of fleet impervious to the atomic bomb of another—an experiment, incidentally, to which the Security Council of the United Nations Organization has not yet been invited. And we clutch desperately to the atomic bomb and our exclusive control of it like a fearful child clutching the hand of an all-powerful father. Meantime, some among us advocate that the military should become the principal guardians and users of this mighty atomic power.

Indeed, those who used to argue that the safeguards of our security were the two oceans now urge us to span all oceans

and move from pole to pole and continent to continent in desperate quest for an illusory military security, while other nations, inevitably apprehensive over all these things, ask, "What is America up to? Is it just security they seek?"

Does all this sound like a nation which feels calm and secure in a world grown small and neighborly?

Let us look at Britain, another member of the Big Three.

Tory and Socialist alike are aquiver over the dangers to their routes to India, over the deterioration of the Empire's life lines, over the possibility of some other powerful nation getting a foothold in the Mediterranean which Britain, 1,500 miles away, seems to regard as her own "Mare Nostrum."

Why does she keep 4,000,000 men under arms? Why does she maintain armies of so-called "protection" in Greece, Palestine, Egypt, Indonesia, India, Indo-China, Burma, and everywhere else along the routes of Empire? Exhausted and financially pressed as she is, beset with tremendous domestic recovery problems which for their solution require the strong arms of all her men and women, Britain still keeps huge armies on the alert, and constantly is building a greater Navy, a greater air force, carrying on desperately research in the improvement of war weapons and in the science of war, and reaching out eagerly and earnestly for bilateral alliances and nonaggression compacts.

Even with the United Nations Organization established and the Security Council at work, Britain acts the part of a nation on the brink of war. She holds onto her corner of the atomic bomb like grim death, backing America's stand on secrecy with a determination born of panic.

Is this the picture of a great nation and a people which has just emerged victorious from her most dangerous of all wars and now faces confidently the future in a safe and prosperous world?

Now let us take the third member, Russia.

Russia is strong today. But after a bitter yesterday, Russia looks apprehensively to what she may encounter tomorrow. She is suspicious. Denied the atomic bomb, denied warm water outlets, denied the common courtesy of economic negotiations with her greatest ally, believing that her philosophy is such that she will never be accepted by nations dominated by cartels, reactionaries, or Russophobes, Russia is beset with many fears.

She reads the newspapers of Britain and the United States. She learns of the speeches made by men in high office, including the speeches made in the Congress. She makes an application for a loan from her old comrade in arms, the United States, and what happens to it?

In the words of Generalissimo Stalin to me last September in Moscow. "Six months have elapsed and Russia has not even had an answer to her application for a \$6,000,000,000 loan to help her repair the damage of war and raise the standard of living of the Russian people."

After this conversation, the American Embassy in Moscow wrote a letter to the Soviet Foreign Office calling atten-

tion to an earlier letter from the United States advising that American policy had not yet been formulated with respect to such loans. Another 6 months elapses and meanwhile a \$3,750,000,000 loan has been specially negotiated with another power and laid before the Congress. But Cabinet members in Washington say there never was such an application made. Maybe Stalin did not know.

Then the startling announcement is made that there was a Russian application for an Export-Import Bank loan, but it got lost in a pigeonhole and has just been discovered.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I had hoped to be able to continue without interruption, if the Senator does not mind.

Russia forms her own opinion of whether a Russian loan would be recommended by the American Government and could pass the American Congress, and thereafter adopts her 5-year plan to the desperate need of lifting herself by her own bootstraps.

The Soviet Union too keeps a great army, the greatest in the world under arms, and lays great plans for its new strength and power. She works desperately to build her own atomic bomb and to provide new and improved weapons of war. In the Far East, in the Middle East, in the Mediterranean, in the Balkans, in eastern Europe, and in the Baltic, she strives to build a "Magnet line" of security. She reaches out eagerly for critical and strategic materials, particularly oil. And she must take from the low standard of living of her people, a people who have suffered more than any great nation in history from war, the materials and the manpower with which to support this security machine.

Russia knows what war is. Hence her fear is not imaginary. It grows out of anguish and suffering. It rises from the smoking, battered ruins of her devastated areas, from the 15,000,000 men, women, and children—50 times our losses—she lost in this war, from the 25,000,000 whom that war left homeless and starving, from all those who went hungry, poorly clothed, and wretchedly housed, to defeat those enemies who with fierce barbarity and unspeakable atrocity invaded her soil and attacked her people.

I heard of the incident of Russian slave laborers being transported into Germany; of women hastily snatched from their homes without regard to their health, some of them giving birth to babies in the slave train, and the Gestapo snatching those newborn babies from the clutching embrace of mothers and hurling them out the window to perish in the snow beside the track.

Russia's fear is aggravated by her memory of the past. She remembers the summer of 1919, when the armies of 14 nations, including Britain, France, China, the United States, Germany, and Japan were waging war against the new Soviet Union upon Soviet soil.

She remembers the 7,000,000 Russian men, women, and children who perished in battle or from starvation and disease in 2½ years of bloody intervention and

civil war, and the estimated \$60,000,000,000 of property damage she suffered in the same period.

The Russians remember what Winston Churchill himself, on another day and in another mood, said of this period. He said:

Were they (the Allies) at war with Russia? Certainly not. But they shot Soviet Russians at sight. They stood as invaders on the Russian soil. They armed the enemies of the Soviet Government. They blockaded its ports and sank its battleships. They earnestly desired and schemed its downfall. But war? Shocking. Interference? Shame. It was, they repeated, a matter of indifference to them how Russians settled their own affairs. They were impartial—Bang!

Russia remembers the Red baiting, the articulated and open conspiracy against her among the major capitalistic powers of the world, which went on after foreign military forces were withdrawn or driven from the Soviet Union, and the long period when she was feared and hated by all and recognized by none.

She remembers how long it was before Britain recognized her established Government, and that more than a decade passed, after her Government was in indisputable power and authority, before Franklin D. Roosevelt became President of the United States and recognized her.

She remembers how long it was before she was permitted entry into the League of Nations, and then how her sober pleas for collective security and for disarmament were contemptuously ignored.

She remembers how Hitler was built up against her and how she was denied an invitation to Munich, where it was made virtually certain that Hitler would strike her.

She remembers the German-Japanese-Italian conspiracy to destroy Russia under the hypocritical pretense of the Anti-Comintern Pact, and that no nation of strength and power protested against such proposed aggression.

She remembers the iron curtain which for generations the western European powers have dropped down between Russia and the Middle East, the Mediterranean, the Balkans, and eastern Europe.

Yes; Russia remembers the efforts made to divert Hitler against her alone, the Senators in the United States Senate who voted to make lend-lease illegal for Russia, and the prophecies made in Europe and the United States that she would quickly collapse under the Nazi hammer blows.

If we, with our atomic bomb, with the greatest navy in the world, the largest air force, and the most superbly equipped army, are fearful; if we, for security, defend a zone which now includes the Western Hemisphere, the Pacific Ocean, Japan, and central China, and the Atlantic Ocean north to Iceland and east to the Azores; if Britain's defense zone embraces western Europe, the Mediterranean, the Near East, Africa, and south-west Asia, as well as the seven seas, is there any real wonder that Russia, knowing the horrors of war as we never have known them, as even the British have not known them, is determined that never again shall the cruel assault which she

has experienced twice in one generation come to curse her?

Yes; the world is in the grip of fear. We face today a crisis of confidence.

This siege of fear reaches from the highest heads of state to the lowliest man in the street.

We read in the papers what the heads of state say. Each of us in his own experience knows what the common man is saying. A taxi driver in my presence 2 nights ago cursed his luck that he was just home from the Pacific, just back with his wife and two dirty little chubby kids, as he put it, just having bought his new cab, and now it seemed as though he would have to chuck it all again and go off to war once more.

Fear-mongering is the tactic of the warmongers. It is the tactic of those whose over-all strategic conception is war.

Can we not allay this great and all-pervading fear among the nations?

Can we not prevent the vicious cycle of so-called defensive measures and countermeasures which are brutally undermining the foundations of world peace?

War, Mr. President, does not spring, like Minerva, full-blown from the brow of Jove. War is not made by a single, overwhelming decision. It is made by an accumulation along the way of minor decisions, some witting, some unwitting, which make the final decisions of war inevitable. War is built up stone by stone, as it were; it develops step by deliberate step; it creeps up mistake by mistake, misjudgment after misjudgment, until, too late, the guns go off.

What, then, is the way out of this web of fear?

We may in the beginning ask what are the blind alleys which do not lead out, which enmesh us all the deeper.

First is the blind alley of unilateral nationalism or isolationism. No nation today is strong enough to be secure alone, no matter if it does have, in the words of the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, "an adequate army, a superior navy, and a superlative air force"—and even, I might add, the almighty bomb.

The second blind alley is the program of "getting tough," as some urge, or waving the big stick. All you have to do, Mr. President, is to read history to learn that Britain or Russia or the United States do not frighten easily. And these nations have not been accustomed to run even before force, let alone to quiver before epithets, however stentorian be the tones in which they are uttered.

The third blind alley is the bilateral alliance or the balance-of-power conception of security. Both of these belong to a dead day. We have passed them on the way upward and forward. And that is true even if you call the bilateral alliance a "fraternal association."

And we must confess that at the present time and under the present circumstances the United Nations Organization is not the way out of this web of fear.

The United Nations Organization was founded upon the principle of the unity of the Big Three. It is not, as certain

Senators repeatedly assured us, a super-state or a world government. It is a compact of sovereign states, because it could not have gotten by the Senate had it been anything else.

It was never expected, when it was created, that the United Nations Organization had the power to act against one of the Big Three, for the veto was the inevitable incident of the principle that it was a compact among sovereign states of unimpaired sovereignty. It is a delusion and a snare to regard the present United Nations Organization as the tribunal for the solution of the clashes and conflicts among the Big Three growing out of their fear for their own security.

And those who pretend now that the United Nations Organization can perform such functions are either, without disclosing their purpose, attempting to wreck it or to convert it from its declared original character into something else.

If an attempt is made to settle one of the major issues among the Big Three, the veto power would, of course, be used by the nation affected. Then the United Nations Organization would be utterly helpless; and we knew that when we ratified it in the Senate. Its framers knew that when they conceived it at Dumbarton Oaks and at San Francisco.

If, after a veto, the other two of the Big Three attempt to use the machinery of the United Nations Organization against the third member of the Big Three to coerce it, or if outside the United Nations Organization they use force, then the world is faced with war.

Also, the United Nations Organization is wrecked if two of the Big Three under the cloak of the United Nations Organization form another cordon sanitaire around the third of the big trinity.

In fact, it was never expected that the United Nations Organization would function save upon the sturdy base of the unity of Great Britain, Russia, and the United States. We must, therefore, prepare outside the United Nations Organization the conditions which will make it possible for the United Nations Organization effectively to function, just as with respect to the proposed loan to Britain we are today preparing the foundations upon which the Bretton Woods agreement can work.

Nor will the problem be solved by attempting at this time to change the character of the United Nations Organization by a drive to scrap the veto power.

What, then, is the way out of this crisis of fear? And how can the United Nations Organization and the peace be saved?

I venture to suggest that the only way is to carry out the grand conception of Franklin Delano Roosevelt who, more than any other, is responsible for the United Nations Organization, and to re-establish the unity of Great Britain, Russia, and the United States, and to bring about a whole new mental and spiritual attitude on the part of these powers toward peace and plenty.

But at the very outset one asks the question, How can such unity now be re-established and how can we dispel this fog of distrust and fear, and dedicate

these great powers to a new victory of peace and plenty?

I suggest let there be convened at once a meeting of the heads of the Governments of Great Britain, Russia, and the United States and a full-scale conference of the Big Three set under way post haste. Of course, at such a conference the foreign offices of the three Governments would be strongly represented. But that is not enough to provide delegations truly representative of the will to peace of these three countries and the gravity and comprehensiveness of the issues to be considered at such a conference.

Among our representatives, for example, there should be Eisenhower, and from Russia there must be Zhukov, and from the British, Alexander and others like these men who have worked together. Each of these men has the complete respect and confidence of the military men of the other Big Three Powers. And incidentally, no one of them ever hurled across the council table an epithet against another.

And there must be businessmen, labor leaders, leaders of agriculture, women, veterans of this war and the youths who would be the cannon-fodder of another war.

This conference would have the commission of staying in session until its task was done. Its scope and agenda must be the restoration of confidence among the Big Three by working out agreement on three fundamental issues—military, economic, political or cultural—which today are holding up agreement on the specific issues that come before the Security Council. The task of the conference is in effect to clear the way for the Security Council and the General Assembly. It will not seek agreement on detail, but on those basic principles on which the detailed issues pivot.

I. SECURITY THE MAJOR ISSUE

The major issue facing this conference will be the issue of security and the resolution of the fears of each and all of the three great powers.

The first task on the security agenda is to insure that we shall never allow Germany and Japan to make war again. There can be no peace, no hope of peace, unless these two war-making nations shall forever be purged of the power to make war.

That means we must thoroughly carry out our purpose of demilitarization, denazification, decentralization, decartellization, and reeducation of the German people. The same things must be ruthlessly done in Japan.

I shall never forget, sitting with Generalissimo Stalin in the Kremlin and hearing him tell me that the war we have just suffered grew out of our policy of leniency toward Germany after the last war, and of his fears that we are now making the same mistake about Japan. I shall never forget seeing him strike his fist upon the table in front of him and saying, with that resolute spirit which hurled the Nazis back from the throat of his country, "Never again must Germany and Japan be allowed to make war."

Obviously neither the Big Three nor the United Nations Organization should

stop when we destroy nazism and fascism in Germany. We should also cut out the roots which have now reached into Spain and Argentina.

It is a larger subject than I can adequately cover here, but it seems to me that we cannot successfully accomplish this purpose of keeping Germany from waging war again unless we put under international control and detach from the Reich the Ruhr, and the Rhineland; unless we detach and set up Bavaria as an independent country, as it once was for a thousand years; and unless, following the suggestion of Sumner Welles, we divide into two parts the remainder of the country along historical divisions.

These severed parts of Germany could economically exist and the people in them enjoy a good life and a decent standard of living without Germany as such again having the unity and the character which would give it the power to make war. Mr. President, a nation which three times since 1870 has attacked its neighbors, the last two times engulfing the world in the maelstrom of war, has forfeited its right to be a nation until it has gone through an adequate period of penance and probation.

Of course, this division of which I speak can be begun or accomplished only when our occupation policies are carried out, and we are ready to bring Germany under a permanent peace treaty.

Second on the security agenda must be atomic power. It is senseless to think that there can be a stable and secure world as long as only a part of the major powers have the atomic bomb. It is folly to expect Russia to sit supinely by and not make every desperate effort to provide for its own security this incalculably dangerous and destructive weapon while others have it perfected and are producing bombs for their stock piles. There can be only a panicky atomic bomb race among the great powers if this question is not satisfactorily resolved.

It is impossible to measure the damage already done to world peace and security—and, I may add, to international confidence in the purpose of future America—by our failure to admit this obvious fact.

Moreover, though atomic power is potentially the greatest boon humanity has ever had it can never be developed to serve mankind unless it is finally disposed of as a threatening weapon of war, and kept safely out of military hands. For the military knew only one use of atomic power, and that is to use it for war and destruction. We need only to make the simple inquiry as to what would have happened in the world to the steam engine and electricity if they had been primarily developed as instruments of war, and kept by the military from the free and open channels of science and progress.

Let America, therefore, take the lead in proposing a resolution of this most dangerous of issues among the Big Three. I would prefer that we should first, before the convening of such a conference, after calling on Britain and Canada to join us, destroy every atomic bomb which we have, and smash every facility we possess which is capable of producing only destructive forms of atomic energy.

Then we could go into the court of this conference with the cleanest of hands to talk about the future control of atomic power for the purposes of peace and outlawing it for war.

Of course, we should have stopped the whole atomic bomb production process on VJ-day. Our failure to do so has already not only precipitated suspicion and ill will, and many of the acts of provocation now being committed in the world, but a desperate atomic bomb race among the major powers is already on the way.

But it will not be imperative that we destroy our atomic bomb facilities before going to such a conference if we will solemnly offer to do so, if the other members of the Big Three will covenant to destroy all such facilities which they have, and if all of us will agree that the fullest access to all of our countries shall be allowed to representatives of the Security Council to witness in all our countries such destruction.

We should all have to pledge ourselves never to make any weapon out of atomic energy and to give representatives of the Security Council the most open and the freest right of examination of our facilities and research in this field at all times.

Our agreement to destroy our own bomb-making facilities must also be upon condition that all the present and future body of knowledge respecting atomic energy shall be freely poured into the international channels of science and become the common property and the newest servant of mankind.

To those to whom these suggestions may sound shocking let me say that there can be no great secret like this long kept by anyone, and that the alternative to this suggestion is a desperate atomic armament race and, in the end, war. Only if all nations have this knowledge, and all of us outlaw it, can there be any security for any of us against it.

Surely, when we can lift ourselves up enough to see atomic power in perspective, we must agree that if atomic energy is made a weapon of war, with the growing means of hurling projectiles and with further development of the atomic bomb which is inevitable, it can only mean mass destruction for us all.

On the other hand, if atomic power is employed as an instrument of peace it can lift the human race to heights of security, abundance, and happiness which would have seemed fantastic before its discovery. But we cannot just drift and expect security and stability in the world so long as we, Britain, and Canada hold the atomic bomb like a Damoclean sword over the heads of Russia and the rest of the world.

The next most important question upon the security agenda at the conference will be the joint occupation by the Security Council of strategic bases and areas of the world.

Mr. President, you can no more expect Russia to accept her confinement behind the iron curtain of military and naval bases, fleets and airforces of western European powers and the United States than you can expect her to take supinely her being shut in behind the curtain of atomic armaments.

Today one of the essential causes which provokes the threat of war is the occupation of strategic bases and areas by certain powers and the exclusion of other powers. Indeed the major tension which exists today between Russia and Britain in the Middle East and the Mediterranean can be directly attributed to this fact.

Again, let the United States take the lead in proposing the joint occupancy by the powers on the Security Council of the strategic army, navy, and air bases held by any nation outside its own homeland. Each nation of course which now has treasured bases will feel that it is giving up an essential to its security. But if we all give up exclusive occupation and do it with a new spirit and a new attitude we will need them for war, and our security will be far better guaranteed than by exclusive possession and control in an armed and jittery world.

Britain and the United States might as well face this matter realistically. It is the worst kind of illusion and folly for us to believe that Russia, occupying one-sixth of the earth's surface and having one-tenth of the world's population—a people able, strong and brave—will acquiesce indefinitely in the mastery of every ocean and sea and every strategic area on the earth by our two countries, without striving to break that stranglehold.

Against the background of British and American domination of the strategic areas of the earth, to make a mountain out of Russia's demands in the Dardanelles is not only gross inconsistency but an intolerance which smacks of international arrogance. On the other hand, if no member of the Big Three had anything to fear from either of the other two and we had the United Nations Organization with its Security Council really functioning, what danger would there be in the world for anybody?

There must have been many men of the American frontier who really thought there would never come a day when men could be safe without carrying their own guns on their hips or their own rifles in the crook of their arm. We all gave up our arms, yet we feel safer under a system of domestic collective security without them.

I realize how difficult is this matter, and yet I know how deadly is war, and the time has come for us to make an all-out attack on war and to destroy it.

Fourth on this agenda must be the implementation of the covenant of the Atlantic Charter that nations shall have equal access to the critical raw materials of the earth. For as long as oil remains a critical commodity in the waging of war and in the pursuits of peace, that covenant implies that Russia shall have fair access to the oil reserves of territories outside her own homeland, as do the other Big Two.

It is to be regretted that the oil treaty recently negotiated was not broadened to include Russia, instead of being limited to Britain and the United States alone. No doubt the reason Russia was not included in the treaty-making was because it concerned the oil of the Middle East, and Russia has been excluded from access to the oil in that area.

It is not necessary to remind you, Mr. President, how the oil in the Middle East is now held.

In Saudi Arabia, the greatest oil reserve in the world outside of the United States, the exclusive concessions are held by two United States companies.

In Iraq, British, French, Dutch, and American interests and a man who got the original concession and has a minority interest have exclusive control of all the petroleum reserves.

In Iran, the British have all the concessions for the exploitation of the extensive oil deposits found there.

Is it really surprising that the Russians should for a long time have been seeking oil concessions in the north of Iran, adjacent to the Russian homeland, and have encouraged the independence movements in that area if they were denied such concessions? We are not simple enough to believe that all of these concessions by foreign countries in the Middle East were procured without recourse to the tactics of power politics.

I wonder what our attitude would be if the powers of the world had sought and gained exclusive exploitation of the oil of Mexico, and the United States had been denied access to that area. Our own history is perhaps not free of diplomatic and military intervention for economic elbow room.

If we are to have peace, we must provide peaceful methods for nations to gain access to the strategic and critical materials of the modern world. Here again, let America, as it was one of the authors of the Atlantic Charter, become the first advocate of this principle, and remove that friction which disunites the Big Three today and threatens not only the United Nations Organization, but the peace of the world.

Fifth, upon this security agenda, must come the colonial question. For this question not only involves the question of raw materials, but it goes to the very heart and core of democracy and freedom in the modern world. It is offensive to the living, and an affront to the dead, that nations recently liberated from the Nazi oppressor by American blood and treasure should so soon become the oppressors of others.

Nations cannot expect to stand on high, lofty principles in their pronouncements and violate democratic rights in practice.

We cannot say that the Atlantic Charter was intended for the west and not for the east.

The right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, by the solemn assurances of our own declaration, was not limited by God to any especially favored part of the world.

Surely, the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations Organization should become both the protector and the benefactor of the dependent or retarded peoples of the world. Every mandate awarded by the League of Nations should be revoked or assigned to the international control of the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations Organization, if the mandated area is not ready for independence.

And here let me suggest that the tranquillity of the whole troubled Middle

East can best be assured by every foreign power removing its forces and by placing Palestine under the Trusteeship Council.

Mr. President, it comes with ill grace from certain world powers whose troops are stationed in every nation from Egypt to Singapore to make a world conflagration out of the movement of a few troops a few miles into a neighboring territory to resist an oil monopoly which they enjoy. And if American foreign policy is made the scapegoat for such imperialism it is more stupid than I thought it possible for it to be.

Once the conflict of the powers over oil in the Middle East is resolved this great area can, with the aid of the Social and Economic Council and their own great and growing strength and resources, move into a new and larger life of their own.

Mr. President, I could recite conversations with Cabinet members all through the Middle East begging the American Government representatives to present to their Government their own aspirations for independence. It is a good idea to look around a little every now and then and see the sham and hypocrisy which sometimes appear from responsible mouths.

II. ECONOMIC COLLABORATION

I have spoken of security as the first major subject on the agenda of this new enlarged meeting of the Big Three. The second major subject must be economic collaboration among the Big Three.

Here America must lead or be the nation to suffer most. We have now dedicated ourselves to the only condition in which democracy can flourish, namely full employment of its resources. We cannot have full employment in America, we cannot have the full use of our facilities in agriculture or industry, unless we have great markets all over the world. Conversely, the torn fabric of the world's economy cannot be repaired without our aid and support.

We know there cannot be peace, except upon a stable economic base in the world. Economic war will lead to a shooting war. But economic collaboration among the nations of the world will lead not only to peace but to prosperity.

For the United States, economic isolationism is as dangerous as political isolationism. To deny a loan for useful purposes reasonably within a nation's ability to repay, is as dangerous to the security of the United States as it was to deny a nation essential to our defense in war, lend-lease.

It is not a question of our being able to make a British loan, a French loan, a Russian loan, or a loan to any other power meeting reasonable conditions. We cannot afford not to make such a loan, for it is our goods which these loans eventually will buy, our factories they will keep in production, our workers they will employ, our farmers for whom they will provide markets.

Here again, America has the golden opportunity of all time, and here again, we must have broad vision and act with boldness.

What I have said primarily relates to our own well-being. Need I remind you,

Mr. President, of how desperate is the plight of these friends and allies of ours beyond the seas, these hundreds of millions of people striving to live again like men? These many nations and peoples deserve our help in their struggle to rebuild their devastated lands and to contribute again the many things the world needs, and in our hearts we know that our people want to give help.

It is folly to think of rejecting the British loan. No businessman would refuse aid to his best customer going through a temporary crisis. A prosperous Britain is necessary to a prosperous world and a prosperous America.

And a loan to Russia is just as right as a loan to Britain. Stalin told me the Soviet Union would pay back any loan they received as they have repaid all their loans in the past and that they would use it to repair the damage of war and to raise the living standards of the Russian people, among the poorest in Europe.

They need such a loan to buy in this country the heavy machinery required to start their industries again, the farm machinery needed for their fields, the rolling stock for their railroads, the electrical equipment for their power plants, the machinery with which to open their mines and oilwells again.

To deny that loan because we fear Russia or hate communism means that we drive Russia to tightening instead of liberalizing her economy, to restricting instead of extending the liberties and the living standards of her people, and that we force her to the conclusion that we will never be her real friend, and her future must be made only through her own strength and her own separate way. Nor do we aid our own heavy industries and the workers in them by such blind substitution of prejudice for reason. Wise leadership on our part in the field of economic collaboration will lead not only to our prosperity and our peace but to the development of the backward areas of the earth by enterprising businessmen from this and other lands and to lifting up the major part of the whole human family.

III. POLITICAL AND CULTURAL COOPERATION

Having at such a conference worked out the problems of security and economic collaboration, it will not be difficult to establish a working basis for enduring political and cultural collaboration among the Big Three and among all nations of the world.

Once we have removed the fear of war and the fear of want, knowledge and culture will flow in ever-expanding streams to all parts of the earth. Then the Social and Economic Council of the United Nations Organization will really begin to function and become the booster pump for the further extension of all human knowledge and skills, scientific and artistic. With the body of knowledge the human race now has, and favorable conditions for its expansion, the magnificence of the edifice we can raise above the human mind and spirit surpasses the imagination.

To those who say that such a conference and such a program outlined are impractical, I say they are the only practical prospect for a peaceful and prosperous world.

It will require, of course, a new order of thinking, a new attitude on the part of the governments of the peoples of these three great powers, and especially on the part of their representatives at such a conference.

To a great degree, there must indeed be new kinds of representatives at such a conference if it is to have the hope of success.

Such representatives must be men and women who dare, for the sake of peace, to make an all-out attack upon war, and the causes of war, and the agitators for war. Such men and women representing this Nation must be capable of protecting America's interests through the practice of enlightened selfishness, and they must always act under the compulsion that men never had a more solemn responsibility than they. There has never been such a penalty for failure, such reward for success, as faces such a group.

And such a conference cannot begin, and surely cannot succeed, without a new spirit on the part of our Government—executive and legislative.

And here let me speak to my friend, the truly able senior Senator from Michigan. Few, if any, men in all the land have had the influence upon recent American foreign policy he has had. The necessity of the collaboration by the minority party with the party in power to make possible an effective national foreign policy and the distinguished Senator's admitted leadership of his party in foreign affairs have given him an awful responsibility to his country and to the world.

If I speak candidly to him about the essential spirit of his policies, it is not in criticism. It is because the gravity of the occasion requires me to speak with the utmost candor, for it is not his policy but his country's policy that is at stake.

It is pertinent to recall that the Senator from Michigan failed his country as a sentinel when the menace of Hitlerism rose and loomed upon the horizon. He either could not see or did not see that Hitler and nazism threatened the United States and the democratic world. Instead of lending his strength to the efforts of his President and his Secretary of State, he obstructed their efforts and made their work more difficult and dangerous.

He must himself shudder at what would have been the effect of the success of his policies in those dangerous days, as he stood against the repeal of the Neutrality Act and the passage of lend-lease.

As he admonishes Russia today, he may be sure that however fair he intends to be in his counsel, Russia will ever remember that he joined those who voted to make it illegal to extend lend-lease to Russia 3 months before Hitler struck her in 1941.

But, of course, no man in the Congress was more loyal to his country during the war than was the Senator from Michigan. But he will remember that he lent his great strength to resist reference to "an international organization" in the Connally resolution in 1943, the amendment providing for such reference having been offered by 13 Senators, among whom was the Senator from Florida. He must

also recall that when the task of creating the United Nations Organization fell upon the Government, he was adamant in his insistence that it must be a compact of sovereign states with unimpaired sovereignty.

Such a principle of unimpaired sovereignty made it inevitable that the United Nations Organization could not function except upon the base of the unity of the Big Three. He cannot today in mid-stream reverse his course or change the creature which he helped to fashion.

The Senator from Michigan today is the most vigorous and powerful advocate of the newest form of isolationism—the exclusive possession of the atomic bomb by the United States, and the effective control of atomic energy by the military. I say to him that that policy is as dangerous to the eventual security of his country and the peace of the world as his votes against lend-lease and against Russia's eligibility for lend-lease were in 1941.

I have not heard any statement—I could have missed it—from the able Senator from Michigan about the British loan or a French loan. Indeed I have thought him strangely silent on this subject, in view of the leadership which the country, as well as the Congress, attributes to him. I doubt, however, that there is any serious question about what his attitude would be toward a Russian loan.

Nor have I heard any statement from the able Senator in comment upon the "fraternal association" in arms proposed by Mr. Winston Churchill, which strikes, as many of us see it, at the very heart of the unity of the Big Three upon which the United Nations Organization was built and at the survival of the United Nations Organization itself which the Senator so ably helped to build.

I have spoken, as I have said, with a candor which I believe the gravity of the issue of peace or war requires. I have said what I have about the policies of the able Senator from Michigan, whom I am proud to call friend, because such a peace program as I have outlined, which in the very depths of my heart I believe to be the only real bulwark between us and war, will gain immeasurably by his support. I do not want the weight of his strength against it. With his opposition we might not succeed this time, as fortunately we did in the enactment of the preparedness program which President Roosevelt sponsored and which the able Senator opposed. The consequences of failure are too dire to contemplate.

Mr. President, it will be said that what I have proposed displaces the United Nations Organization, and you will ask, What of the coming meeting of the Security Council of the United Nations Organization which is almost upon us? My answer is, that unless there is held such a conference as I propose and that conference succeeds in restoring the confidence of the Big Three in each other by developing agreement on fundamentals, there can be no hope of success at the Security Council meeting.

For lack of unity and divisive antagonism among the Big Three on the pivotal questions will thwart and stifle the Security Council. If the Council attempts

a solution by treating the symptoms of the disagreements and ignoring the root causes, it will find itself upon the rocks.

But on the other hand, if the Security Council is not permitted to become an arena for the exchange of epithets and recriminations, and if a genuine effort is made to restore unreservedly the unity of the Big Three, then the Security Council is equipped to go straight ahead with building the mighty new edifice of a new world.

The Big Three conference, therefore, is to pave the way, to supplement and support, and not to displace, either the objectives or the program of the Security Council or the United Nations Organization. For none more heartily favors the United Nations Organizations than I, no one appreciates more its necessity and its high purpose, no one yearns more eagerly for its unqualified success than I do. But I am raising my voice in warning against putting too soon a strain too severe upon this great hope of future peace without first insuring that the solid foundation has been solidly laid.

Those key problems solved, it is my feeling that the three great powers then being met together, could sweep quickly to solution of specific issues, lesser in significance but nevertheless real, within the framework of the United Nations Organization. The policies so worked out then could become the pattern for collaboration throughout all the United Nations.

I unreservedly support the United Nations Organization and have confidence in its success. But those who propose to thrust into the very forefront of the Security Council's coming discussions these major conflicts among the Big Three without previous preparation and reconciliation among the Big Three, endanger the very life and future of the United Nations Organization itself. There are issues aplenty, arising out of the completion of the war and the wiping out of the Fascist-Nazi menace which require the full attention and action of the Security Council. If these are acted on in the context of Big Three unity, they will in themselves preserve that unity.

We told those who died in World War I that that would be the last war. We failed them. I will not say we betrayed them; I will say only that we failed them. Now, another generation has had to go to war, and many have died, torn out of the arms and hearts of loved ones. Many more have come back—the tragically scarred, the living dead—shut up where they cannot be seen. Many with the anchor of the mind gone. Many maimed and broken. Countless more with the pattern of their lives destroyed and hopelessness where there was once vibrant hope.

Is it not time that we began to pay our debt to all of them, that at long last we keep faith with them? And do we not owe it to the next generation and to those yet unborn to spare them from a similar fate? Is there anything that so much should bear upon the heart and conscience of this generation as the duty to stop war?

Ever since my trip last year through the devastated regions of Europe, I have been haunted by the grim vision of the destruction and death which confronted me wherever I went. I shall never forget, Mr. President, that little cluster of 800 graves of American boys who died in the bombing of the Ploesti oil fields far away in the dim recesses of the Carpathians. I shall never forget that little cemetery around Cassino, where American boys from far-away Texas went and never returned. I shall never forget Dachau and the murder factory.

I think the most awful thing I ever heard was the story of how 90 Russian officers were shot at Dachau. They were led out to a ditch that might hold the flowing blood, made to kneel on the edge of the ditch, and then were shot, each with a revolver in the back of his head. A man who was one of the stretcher bearers told me the story in the eerie darkness of that Dachau camp—how he moved one of the bodies into the chamber adjoining the crematory, and how he entered that large room, writhing with human beings, like worms. Immediately in front of him rose up the ghastly figure of a Russian officer who somehow had staggered to his feet, blood streaming down his face, with tousled hair, wondering whether it was this or the other world in which he found himself.

I can never forget the graves, the concentration camps, the murder factories, the maimed women and the little children, the hunger-ridden and the homeless I saw. It is a part of the indescribable horror of war.

Before us then, is the choice, war or peace, poverty or plenty, hopelessness or hope.

If this decision were left to a free choice of the people of America, to the people of the Big Three, to the Russians whose faces wreathed in smiles and friendship when one said, "Amerikanski" to them, I know what the decision would be. I know that more than all else in the world they pray for peace, and there is no price they can pay for it so dear to them as the sons and daughters, the loved ones, they would have to feed into the mouth of war.

If we could catch and feel the voice of all the hundreds of millions affected by our decision, and if, searching our hearts, we strove only to do right, I know, too, what our choice would be.

I have faith that out of the unspeakable suffering of this war a new will for peace has burst forth and that those in places of authority have the opportunity to express that will and to make this dream of the centuries for a world of peace and plenty at last come gloriously true.

We may delay it; we may temporarily thwart it, but be assured the people's will for a people's peace will prevail.

If we delay and thwart temporarily that will by yielding to the siren calls of the selfish and the short-sighted, be assured we will not escape their wrath.

I have faith that there is in the hearts of men a new purpose and that at long last the hosts of the earth are marching forward in a new brotherhood in peace and plenty under God.

AMENDMENT TO FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1349) to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for himself and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL].

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gurney	Murray
Austin	Hart	Myers
Bailey	Hatch	O'Daniel
Ball	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Hayden	Overton
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Belbo	Hill	Radcliffe
Brewster	Hoy	Reed
Buck	Huffman	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Capper	Kilgore	Smith
Carville	Knowland	Stanfill
Chavez	La Follette	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McKellar	Tunnell
Eastland	McMahon	Tydings
Ellender	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Maybank	Walsh
Fulbright	Mead	Wheeler
George	Millikin	White
Gerry	Mitchell	Wiley
Gossett	Moore	Willis
Green	Morse	
Guffey	Murdoch	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EASTLAND in the chair). Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I offer two amendments to the Ellender-Ball amendment to the committee amendment to the pending bill. The amendments relate to the employment of children under 18 years of age by such companies as Western Union and others, the child employees of which are engaged principally in picking up and delivering messages. I ask that the amendments be read, printed, and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2 it is proposed to strike out lines 10 and 11 and in lieu thereof insert the following:

(b) Section 6 (b) of the act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall not apply with respect to any messenger under 18 years of age employed principally in picking up and delivering letters and messages or performing errand services, if such messenger is paid wages at a rate not less than 55 cents an hour."

On page 3, line 2, before the period, insert a colon and the following:

Provided, That this subsection shall not apply with respect to messengers employed principally in picking up and delivering letters and messages or performing errand services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendments of the

Senator from Arkansas to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not insist on a vote being taken upon the amendments today. I shall later ask that they be considered.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter which I have received from the Secretary of Agriculture. The letter deals with the rider containing the provisions of the so-called Pace bill which it is proposed to add to the pending bill. I think it is important that all Members of the Senate have access to the letter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
March 14, 1946.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on
Education and Labor,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: You have asked me for the comments of the Department of Agriculture on the possible effect of adding to the minimum wage bill as a rider the provisions of the so-called Pace bill (H. R. 754), which provides for including an allowance for all farm labor at wage rates paid to hired farm labor in the calculation of the parity index.

I desire to make my comments in two different categories. First of all, I will give you the general comments of the Department of Agriculture as to the effect of the Pace bill in any normal period of farming activity. By that I mean that I would like to consider the Pace bill completely apart from its implications in the present situation. Then I would like to point two or three things which are of current importance and which, in my opinion, add greatly to the arguments that might be made against the inclusion of that bill as a rider on the minimum wage bill.

First of all, then, I give you these general comments as representing the viewpoint of the Department of Agriculture on the provisions of the bill without regard to current world shortages in grain and the present adjustment period of industrial wages.

Assuming that the Pace bill would not change the calculation of parity in any way except for the inclusion of the wage allowance, its enactment would increase parity prices by about one-third. At first glance, such an increase in parity prices might seem attractive from the farmers' standpoint. There are several considerations, however, which indicate that this may not be the case, that the enactment of the Pace bill might actually work against the farmers' interest. Some of these are:

(1) Parity prices as now calculated are an accepted standard for farm prices. The current parity formula has been of more value to farmers than any other formula or similar argument that has so far been advanced. Farmers and their representatives should rather carefully consider what they are doing before the current parity index is revised or substantially altered.

(2) The Pace formula calls for adding an allowance for all farm labor, including the unpaid labor of the farm operator and his family at some relative wage rate which must be a matter of judgment rather than statistical record. Parity prices as now calculated are designed to keep the ratio of prices received by farmers to prices and rates paid by farmers at the same level as prevailed in 1910-14. This purchasing power idea has been and will almost certainly con-

tinue to be of more value to farmers generally than a shift to some form of the cost of production approach. Prices received and prices and rates paid can be statistically measured but cost calculations for agricultural commodities depend almost entirely upon allowances which must be made for the farmers' own labor and the use of his own land and equipment and in the past at least such estimates have led to endless argument.

(3) Enactment of the Pace bill would currently result in a substantial increase in parity prices, but it would also give lower parity prices in periods of severe depression than the method now used. That is, farm wage rates go up further and down further than prices paid, interest, and taxes, with the result that parity prices would be higher when the labor situation was tight and lower in cases of depression.

(4) Enactment of the Pace bill would accentuate the relative disparities which already exist between the several parity prices. That is, the best argument for revising the parity index is for revisions which will bring the parity prices into better line with one another and the existing and prospective demand situation during the several years immediately ahead. A flat percentage increase in all parity prices will not remedy this situation.

(5) The real test ahead for farmers and the farm program is whether support price commitments can be successfully handled once the current food crisis subsides. As an average, farm prices were continuously below the parity level for the 20 years between World War I and World War II and as an average prices received by farmers have only been above the parity level for a short time during and following World War I and World War II. Farmers need a parity price goal which can occasionally be reached, otherwise they will discredit the parity standard and the support price activities which should be connected with it.

(6) In conclusion, farmers and their representatives should be interested not only in the calculation of a theoretical parity but also the manner in which such parity calculations are used. What farmers want is a sound support program which will assure them of reasonable prices over the years ahead rather than an inflationary whirl during the next 2 years, followed by a severe deflation and failure of the support price program. An immediate increase of 33 percent in parity prices would certainly lead to inflation and an effort to support prices for agricultural products generally at 133 percent of the current parity level would almost certainly wreck any general price support program as conditions return to normal. Perhaps parity prices should be revised and perhaps an allowance for hired wages should be included in such a revised index since they are actual cash costs, but there is no reason to believe that a 33 percent jump in parity prices and a shift away from the current purchasing power concept of parity is to the interest of the farmers, entirely aside from its effects on the nonfarm front.

Assuming that the Pace bill, H. R. 754, would not change the calculation of parity in any way except for the inclusion of a wage allowance for all farm labor, its enactment would increase the parity index calculated from the base 1910-14—100 from 173 to 237 as of February 15, 1946. This would increase the parity prices of the principal commodities, such as corn, cotton, and wheat, by about 33 percent. In the case of fruits and vegetables, for which the parity base period is 1919-29, the index would be increased from 116 to 146, or about 26 percent. In the case of flue-cured and burley tobacco, for which the base is 1934-39, the index would be increased from 148 to 206, or about 39 percent. The following table compares prices received

by farmers with parity prices as calculated at present and as indicated under the Pace bill.

Specified farm products: Base period average, prices received by farmers, present parity and parity calculated under Pace formula, Feb. 15, 1946

Commodity	Base period average August 1909 to July 1914	Feb. 15, 1946			
		Prices received by farmers	Parity prices		
			Present	Pace formula ¹	
Wheat.....Bu.	\$0.584	\$1.55	\$1.57	\$2.10	
Corn.....Bu.	.642	1.11	1.14	1.52	
Rice.....Bu.	.813	1.77	1.45	1.93	
Cotton.....Lb.	.124	.2301	.2207	.2939	
Apples.....Bu.	.66	3.75	1.71	2.27	
Hogs.....Cwt.	7.27	14.20	12.90	17.20	
Beef cattle.....Cwt.	5.42	12.60	9.65	12.80	
Lambs.....Cwt.	5.88	13.30	10.50	13.90	
Butterfat.....Lb.	.263	.608	2.480	2.630	
Milk, wholesale Cwt.	1.60	2.33	2.63	2.89	
Eggs.....Doz.	.215	.326	2.356	2.474	
Tobacco:					
Flue-cured.....Lb.	2.229	4.369	.839	.472	
Burley.....Lb.	2.222	.324	.329	.457	
		Comparable prices ¹			
Oranges, on tree Box.....	\$1.81	\$2.12	\$2.10	\$2.64	
Grapefruit, on tree Box.....	.81	1.00	.94	1.18	

¹ Index on August 1909 to July 1914 base, calculated by giving index of prices paid, including interest and taxes, a weight of 68 and all farm labor a weight of 32; August 1919 to July 1929; August 1934 to July 1939, index of prices paid a weight of 65 and all farm labor 35.

² Adjusted for seasonal variation.

³ 5-season average, 1934-38.

⁴ Jan. 15, 1946.

⁵ Computed under sec. 3 (b) of Price Control Act.

⁶ Derived base price 1919-29.

EFFECT ON PRESENT SITUATION

The Department of Agriculture is most seriously concerned with the effect of the enactment of the Pace bill at the present time. There are two principal reasons for this. One is that it is bound to have an upsetting effect on the entire stabilization and price-control program, especially as it relates to food. The other is that it might have a very disturbing effect on the present program in which the United States, along with other exporting countries, is now engaged in an effort to relieve famine, starvation, and probable death among the populations of the world.

Why do I say that it would upset the stabilization and price-control program? The three great basic commodities—corn, cotton, and wheat—are currently at about the parity level and the enactment of the Pace bill would require that ceilings on these commodities be revised upward by about one-third since all ceilings under the price control law must be at or above the parity level. But if ceilings on these commodities are revised upward one-third, ceilings for almost every other crop and class of livestock would have to be adjusted upward in order to maintain a relative price structure about like the one now current. A new round of wage demands would, of course, be generated and the whole stabilization and price-control program wrecked.

Consider, then the other situation, namely the effect this might have on the shipments of meat, wheat, and food fats and oils to those nations and peoples who are now in extremely difficult situations as the result of the destruction of agriculture abroad during the war, the lowered productivity of land, the incidence of famine, the failure of a monsoon in India, and the droughts which have swept France and northern Africa as well as great sections of India and are reliably re-

ported to have been the worst in 60 years. These unfavorable agricultural circumstances have given us a world deficit in importing areas of around 21,000,000 tons of wheat with a supply that possibly can be shipped from exporting countries which totals from eleven to twelve million tons of wheat. This country, with other exporting countries, is striving valiantly to bridge this gap as best it can. By designation from President Truman a National Famine Emergency Council has been appointed and a Famine Emergency Committee has set up headquarters within the Department of Agriculture to give guidance to this work. The Department itself has designated emergency food program managers in each one of the States and counties and is proceeding with steps in every county in the United States to conserve cereals, particularly wheat and wheat products, and to save food fats and oils in order that the most generous contribution can be made to the humanitarian purpose of supplying food world-wide.

I think it entirely possible that the enactment of the Pace bill would have a disturbing influence. The Department of Agriculture is anxious that there shall be stable prices on commodities such as corn and wheat and that these prices only should be raised as parity as now determined may require and not in such a way as to encourage farmers to hoard their wheat and risk deterioration. As late as last December, the Office of Price Administration announced that there would not be further increases in the price of corn except in response to the legal requirements of the parity formula. In compliance with that, corn prices were increased 3 pennies a few days ago and that fact has induced some farmers to believe that the corn price, and even the wheat price, may go up some more and that possibly they would do better to hold on to their precious grains.

That is what we don't want to happen. We believe that grain prices will hold about their present pattern and that any further increases during this marketing season will be infinitesimal, if any increases at all are made. If, however, one of our legislative bodies should pass a proposal that would seemingly offer substantial increases in the price of grain, we would naturally have to assume that the farmer would hold back his grain and decline to market it until final action had been taken by the other House and if action there was also favorable, there would be a further period of waiting until eventual action could be taken by the President on the bill.

Finally there is a whole field for doubt as to just how the provisions of the Pace bill might be applied and what final prices the Department would eventually calculate as meeting the requirements of this proposed legislation. The bill itself provides that parity for all agricultural commodities shall reflect "the cost of all farm labor (on the basis of the national average and including hired workers, farm operators, and members of the families of farm operators engaged in work on the farm, computed for all such labor on the basis of wage rates for hired farm labor), as contrasted with such * * * costs of all farm labor during the base period."

I have raised the question in correspondence as to whether or not this means the cost of all farm labor, or means farm-labor wage rates. There is a vast difference. If it means only the cost of all farm labor, what does it do, for example, to the price of cotton? Would the Department be justified in figuring the cost of farm labor as it relates to cotton in connection with those areas in our great cotton-producing States where the farmer uses a mechanical cotton picker along with all the other modern contrivances to lower labor costs in the handling of cotton? There are those who contend that with the

use of the most modern machinery and with the thorough mechanization of a cotton plantation on a large scale, it is possible to reduce labor costs to a fifth of what they may be when the one-man, one-mule method is employed. If that be true, do you apply your Pace bill formula to the most mechanized plantation or to the smallest, least efficient cotton acreage? I do not say that the problem is insoluble, I merely say that it might be indefinite and that it might require months before the final determination could be made.

Without wishing to extend this letter too greatly, I desire to raise only one other question. The assumption of the Pace bill is that the present parity formula does not allow for changes in labor costs (cash or imputed) and that proper allowance for these costs may be made by tying the price of a unit to the price of an hour of labor. This rules out consideration of any increase in the productivity of labor. Actually, production per farm worker in 1944 was 93 percent higher than in 1910-14. The result was that while farm wage rates per hour increased 215 percent, labor costs per unit of product increased only 59 percent, compared with a 95 percent increase in farm prices. We must be careful that in trying to help the farmer we do not actually harm him.

The farmers of this country, through their organizations, know that the present Secretary of Agriculture has been spending a good deal of time in a discussion of the possible revisions of the parity formula. I have urged repeatedly that if the parity formula is to be changed it should be changed only after most careful study in which the farmers themselves participate. I know that one great farm organization has spent a tremendous amount of time in trying to study the effect of the Pace formula on the parity principle. I would think it would be of interest for the Congress, sometime in its consideration of parity revision, to go into the figures which this farm organization and others have developed. For example, we have some figures in the Department which we have not yet had an opportunity to check, but which indicate that even if farm wage rates were to be included in parity at a weight of 32 percent and the effect of this figured back over the past 25 years, that in 16 of those 35 years the inclusion of farm wages at 32 percent would increase parity prices; in 15 of the 35 years the inclusion of farm wages at 32 percent would decrease parity prices; and in 4 of the 35 years the inclusion of farm wages at 32 percent would make no change.

I do not set this forth as a final answer, nor do I represent it as being scientifically provable. I merely suggest that with that sort of a preliminary showing it is important that any change in the parity formula, which has meant so much to the American farmer, should be made carefully after the most scientific, actuarial study of the effect of the modification upon the present farm price that the farmer will obtain, and upon what might happen to him in years of depression. The farmer, in my opinion, would not be too definitely wedded to a formula which boosted his income in periods of prosperity, but dropped him further into the financial depths in periods of adversity.

I therefore would urge the Congress not to add the Pace bill as a rider to the minimum wage bill. I would urge that the Pace bill, if it is to be considered by the Congress, should be carefully considered by agricultural groups; should be the matter of most serious study by those groups; and should have thrown upon it the light of the most careful scrutiny by accountants and by experts in the field of farm prices. It should never be passed until the farmers of this country have a chance to say, and say clearly, whether they desire to have any tampering with a formula which has improved their lot

by obtaining for them a measure of equality with other sections of our population.

Respectfully yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
SECRETARY.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations is engaged in an important meeting, other committees have important meetings scheduled for this afternoon; and I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EASTLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Lt. Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, United States Army, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Cecil Wayne Gray, of Tennessee, for promotion in the foreign service of the United States of America, from foreign service officer of class 2, to foreign service officer of class 1.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. Edmund B. Gregory to be War Assets Administrator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in connection with the confirmation of Lieutenant General Gregory, I ask to have printed in the Record a letter which I have received from Mr. Paul H. Appleby, Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., March 11, 1946.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: Following your conference with the Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, members of my staff were requested to canvass opinions to determine whether enabling legislation is required to permit General Gregory to serve as War Assets Administrator on and after March 25, if confirmed by the Senate. It is our opinion, which has been concurred in by the Judge Advocate General and the Comptroller General's staff, that no additional legislation is necessary to enable General Gregory to accept the office of War

Assets Administrator on March 25, or to permit him to receive salary as War Assets Administrator in addition to his pay and allowances as lieutenant general of the Army during the period March 25 to June 30, inclusive, and further, that his acceptance of the office of War Assets Administrator does not in any way jeopardize his status as an officer on terminal leave pending retirement from the Army, or his position as a retired officer of the Army, except that after June 30 he must elect to receive either his salary as War Assets Administrator or his retirement pay as a retired officer of the Army. This opinion is based on the following facts:

1. General Gregory went on terminal leave March 7, 1946, pending retirement from the Army June 30, 1946.

2. General Gregory is considered on active-duty status during the period of terminal leave.

3. Revised Statutes, section 1222, prohibits "an officer on the active list * * * from holding civil office," but this prohibition has been removed by Public Law 226, Seventy-ninth Congress, insofar as it applies to this case. Public Law 226, dated November 21, 1945, provides "any person while on terminal leave pending separation from or release from active duty * * * may enter or reenter employment of the Government of the United States * * * and, in addition to compensation for such employment, shall be entitled to receive pay and allowances from the armed services for the unexpired portion of such terminal leave at the same rates and to the same extent as if he had not entered or reentered such employment." The Judge Advocate General, the General Counsel of the Bureau of the Budget, and the Comptroller General's staff have all rendered informal opinions that Public Law 226 modifies section 1222 to permit any person leaving the armed forces to accept employment of the Government of the United States and to receive both compensations during the period of terminal leave and without in any way jeopardizing the officer's status as an officer of the Army. Under Public Law 226, General Gregory would remain on active status during the period of terminal leave and also be permitted to serve as War Assets Administrator.

4. 5 U. S. C. 62 permits retired officers to serve in an office to which appointment is made by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. General Gregory's appointment falls into this status after June 30, 1946, and such appointment does not jeopardize his position as a retired officer.

5. 5 U. S. C. 59a permits a retired officer holding a civilian appointment to elect either his pay from the civil office or his pay as a retired officer when the retired pay amounts to or exceeds the rate of \$3,000 per annum.

I have requested Mr. Latta of the White House staff to prepare a letter of nomination for the President's consideration revising General Gregory's nomination to be effective on March 25, instead of upon his retirement from the Army.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL H. APPELEY,
Assistant Director.

ASSOCIATE JUDGE, MUNICIPAL COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Brice Claggett, of Maryland, to be associate judge of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Herbert W. Christenberry to be United

States Attorney for the eastern district of Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Raymond V. Bowers to be Assistant Chief, Research and Statistics Division, National Headquarters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the Army nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. HILL. I make the same request with regard to the nominations in the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Navy nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. Samuel L. Howard to be major general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed. That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, March 21, 1946, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 20 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Ray J. O'Donnell, of Ohio, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Ohio, vice Byron B. Harlan, resigned.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERAL

Col. Martin Conrad Shallenberger, Infantry.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 20 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION

Lt. Gen. Edmund B. Gregory, to be War Assets Administrator.

ASSOCIATE JUDGE, MUNICIPAL COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Brice Claggett, to be associate judge of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Herbert W. Christenberry, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Louisiana.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Raymond V. Bowers to be Assistant Chief, Research and Statistics Division, National Headquarters, Selective Service System, with compensation at the rate of \$6,230 per annum.

POSTMASTERS

CONNECTICUT

Clara B. Snow, Wapping.
Orrin R. Bugbee, West Suffield.

ILLINOIS

Clarence M. Sullivan, Glen Ellyn.

IOWA

Mary T. Harper, College Springs.
Anna M. Eikenbary, Fertile.
Richard W. Carlson, Yarmouth.

VIRGINIA

Mabele W. Clements, Clayville.
Barron P. Didlake, Glenallen.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To Finance Department

Capt. Maynard Norwood Levenick.

To Corps of Engineers

First Lt. Robert Duncan Brown, Jr.

To Ordnance Department

First Lt. Richard John Rastetter.

To Infantry

First Lt. VanCleave Parrott Warren.
Second Lt. Robert Stephen Mills.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Dwight Moody Young to be lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, with rank from March 15, 1946, subject to examination required by law.

James Emile Graham to be major, Medical Corps, with rank from March 1, 1943.

Jay Franchel Gamel to be major, Medical Corps, with rank from March 1, 1946.

Aubrey L. Jennings to be major, Medical Corps, with rank from March 7, 1946.

James Richard Paul to be captain, Medical Corps, with the rank from March 14, 1946.

Paul Cable Larnc to be captain, Pharmacy Corps, with rank from March 12, 1946, subject to examination required by law.

Emerson Beery Taylor to be captain, Pharmacy Corps, with rank from March 12, 1946, subject to examination required by law.

Thomas Floris Criswell, Jr., to be captain, Pharmacy Corps, with rank from March 12, 1946, subject to examination required by law.

Woodrow Charles Herbert to be captain, Pharmacy Corps, with rank from March 12, 1946.

Paul Francis Crutchlow to be first lieutenant, Pharmacy Corps, with rank from March 31, 1946, subject to examination required by law.

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

To be assistant surgeons, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade)

John C. Ayers	Carmelo C. Celestre
Joseph S. Bower	Robert F. Erhard
Victor Y. Lindblade	Edward J. Healey
Robert L. Fleck	Paul O. Sather

To be assistant civil engineers, with the rank of ensign

Robert B. Childers
Robert R. Graham

To be assistant surgeons, with the rank of ensign

Dan P. Appleby	Josiah B. Henneberger
James A. Smith	Eugene T. MacDonald

To be ensign

Henry A. R. Peyton

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Brig. Gen. Samuel L. Howard to be major general, for temporary service, from September 28, 1942.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 20, 1946

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God, Thou who didst come to open the prison doors and to set the captive free, we pray to be delivered from the limitations of narrowness and the lower spheres of life. Endow us with that outlook in which there is inspiration from Him who dwells above the storm, where is silence full of untroubled peace. O give us a growing ardor, a more intense yearning for the clasp of Thy compassionate hands, that we may move together in the cadences of divine love, in whose ample folds the world may find rest. O God, open our eyes that we may see, our ears that we may hear the music of the spirit, and our hearts that we may gain victory over all things earthly. "Blessed are they who hunger and thirst after righteousness for they shall be filled." O take for our sins the answer of Him who hung upon the Cross, and bring us to Thyself in peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5400. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. REED to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5671. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. GURNEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1821) entitled "An act to amend section 502 of the act entitled 'An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes,' approved October 14, 1940, as amended, so as to authorize the appropriation of funds necessary to provide additional temporary housing units for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MURRAY, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. SMITH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1354) entitled "An act to authorize the permanent appointment in the grades of General of the Army, Fleet Admiral of the United States Navy, and General in the Marine Corps, respectively, of certain individuals who have served in such grades during the Second World War."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5458) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the Departments and Agencies:

1. Department of Commerce.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of the Treasury.
4. Department of War.
5. Government Printing Office.
6. Interstate Commerce Commission.
7. National Archives.
8. Office of Price Administration.
9. Petroleum Administration for War.
10. Selective Service System.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a resolution from the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Helena Aerie, No. 16, Helena, Mont.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a message from the American Legion with reference to granting terminal leave pay to veterans.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances and include newspaper editorials on the recommendations of the reorganization committee.

Mr. STEWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a resolution from the Atoka, Okla., Lions Club.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the Chicago Times and one from the Chicago Sun, and a radio broadcast by Dr. Gerstenfeld.

TERMINAL LEAVE PAY FOR ENLISTED PERSONNEL

Mrs. MANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MANKIN. Mr. Speaker, there is pending in the Committee on Military Affairs the bill H. R. 4051, a bill that would give to the enlisted personnel the same terminal leave rights as are now enjoyed by the officers. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] has just been granted permission to extend his remarks in the Record on this matter, and I hope you will all read his remarks. The purpose of my speaking to you at this time is to ask you to sign discharge petition No. 23. This petition would permit this bill to come to the floor of the House. There are not yet enough signatures on the petition. This is a bill that is of vital interest to all the veterans of the United States, and I think this bill ought to come before us so that we may consider it.

EMERGENCY CONFERENCE FOR CIVILIAN CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Emergency Conference for Civilian Control of Atomic Energy has asked me to make an announcement this morning. This conference is composed of the major national organizations of church, labor, and consumer groups. They are in Washington, D. C., to discuss this important problem, and they are having a meeting in the caucus room of the old House Office Building at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning at which Senator McMahon, of the Special Senate Committee

on Atomic Energy, and Dr. Hogness, professor of nuclear physics at the University of Chicago, will address the assembly. All the Members of the House are cordially invited to attend. This is a bipartisan-sponsored meeting. Congressmen Judd, LaFollette, and Mrs. Douglas of California and myself have sponsored the meeting.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, the ugly shadow of war is creeping back into the hearts, minds, and speech of the American people at a time when we should—yes; must—be devoting all of our energies, our thoughts, and our planning to the building of that decent and peaceful world that so many have thought so much about, talked so much about, and fought for so hard.

I deem it the direct responsibility of the Members of this House—the responsibility of all public officials—to talk straight on this matter, and to give to the people the benefit of all available facts. Peace is our objective. Let us think peace, talk peace, and I believe we can build that decent world. Rumors of wars are unfounded, and most assuredly war is not imminent. It is not, I believe, at all probable. There is always a possibility for war, and there shall perhaps always be, for to this point in history mankind has not yet attained its full objective. The world is only emerging from its bloodiest and most crushing war. We have now reached that point where we cannot afford to succumb to weariness, but must summon new strength and courage and make our attack on the ultimate objective.

Mankind faces its greatest earthly trial, and we are engaged in that period of human relations testing whether or not men can live peaceably upon this earth. Less than success cannot be contemplated for the consequences of failure in the wake of atomic power are beyond the experiences of history. What is said here, fortunately, will little affect our future; what Americans, especially young Americans, think, and so think, do, and say may well herald the life of tomorrow. Time was never more inopportune for indecision, nor for parrotlike utterances of words and ideas that have only a popular appeal to hungry emotions. The time is now for a sound philosophy, straightforward and decent. We cannot afford the luxury of personal, political, or national selfishness, intolerance, or short-sightedness. The immediate benefits and profits are much too costly to those who follow us, and must pay the bill.

It is inevitable that normal individuals, that groups and nations emerge from the nasty, dirty business of war with a touch of emotional, moral, economic, and political hysteria. Our objective, a de-

cent peaceful world is now only attainable, the way cleared by the blood, work, and sacrifice of many millions, not all Americans. Congress has, America has, and the world has the assurance of the President, Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy, and our great American commander, General Eisenhower, that talk of war at this time is absurd. Difficulties yes, but when we speak of international difficulties, we must remember how difficult it is for us to understand each other at home and to get along together and agree. We should talk of peace, we should think of peace, and work for peace. It is a subject we know very little about.

The history of civilization records that only three centuries have been relatively peaceful. During one of these, the nineteenth century, the great powers of the world spent only 30 percent of their time at war. In the period 1500 to 1940 A. D. there was an average of 42 wars per century and 550 battles per century. America has enthusiastically supported two wars during my lifetime. The last one has cost nearly a million casualties and several hundred billion dollars. It has touched every home, and its cost in human suffering is beyond mental calculation. We have given generously, unselfishly, and enthusiastically because we believe in a future, a future of organized governed international relations, in a decent and peaceful world. We can have that, or, we can have a future of bigger and better wars with the marvels of science prostituted to more successful death dealing. We have proved our powers of destruction, let us then prove our power of construction. But peace is not without a price, and the answer is as to whether or not we in America are willing to pay the price of peace, may well determine the course of future events. Perhaps you say it is foolish to question whether or not we are willing to pay the cost of peace. In terms of ordinary truths, what price can we expect peace to cost?

First. We must understand that the world is small and peopled with many millions of human beings who are not Americans but nevertheless are human, and their philosophy, thoughts, economy, and well-being inevitably affect us. Yes, I mean that to some extent we are our brothers' keepers. We must basically accept our responsibility to treat them as we would have them treat us.

Second. We must understand that years of teaching "isms" have deprived the people of many lands of the ability to think along decent lines. Their sense of values is warped. Until men have been educated to the point of decent reasoning, we must be in position to protect our hard and bloodily earned peace with power. We must support a strong Army, Navy, and Air Force for many years to come.

Third. We must understand that a world organization based upon the dignity of individuals and peoples as governments must be the means to settlement of disputes between nations. And we must understand that the basis of such organization cannot be perfect.

Neither can we, as Americans, expect to write it without regard for other nations.

You see, we Americans like to feel we are the only ones who suffered in this war.

That thought alone is sufficient to breed other wars.

Fourth. We must understand that special interests, some businesses, and at times national interest, must be modified, looking to a peaceful world.

You say your propositions are simple and easy. But when the program is started and so and so's business is hurt or endangered, he screams aloud and long, and says that we are not Uncle Sam but Uncle Sap, and he uses all his power to excite Congress and the people to enact legislation to place him in a safe harbor. He was patriotic in war, but he is not willing to pay the price of peace—it hurts his business.

I say the thousands of white crosses, the overflowing hospitals, the hundreds of thousands of gold stars, are evidences of hurt and sacrifice no business can ever equal.

I say that if some individual or business must be hurt to assure that there will be no more of war—it is a price worth paying.

Hungry people must be fed, countries restored to the end that they can be self-supporting. It will cost money. Many say it is not our responsibility, not our job. But you know that hungry, destitute, morally deficient people are not receptive to talk of peace and good government. I firmly believe America has the key to a peaceful world. We need not lower our standards of living to achieve this, but America must say to the Congress and executive department: "Carry on." We are ready to pay the price of peace—involving lowered trade barriers, international credit machinery, monetary stabilization, commodity agreements, relief and rehabilitation, control of cartels, and other measures which threaten our chances of a secure and lasting peace.

THE LATE MISS MABEL BOARDMAN

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon in the great National Cathedral all that was mortal of Miss Mabel Boardman will be laid to rest. It is very fitting that the cathedral should honor this great noblewoman, this great humanitarian. I believe no man or woman in the world has ever received more eulogy, more appreciation than she for her surpassing work for humanity, for those who may be injured and for those who suffered at home and abroad.

In the eyes, Mr. Speaker, of this country and of the nations of the world, Miss Mabel Boardman has personified the Red Cross. Those who loved her and ad-

mired her will try to follow in her footsteps.

[From the New York Times]

MABEL T. BOARDMAN OF RED CROSS DIES—
LONGTIME NATIONAL SECRETARY SERVED
WITHOUT PAY FROM ITS REORGANIZATION IN
1905—DREW UP HIGH STANDARDS—INSPIRING
LEADER, ADMINISTRATOR WAS DESCENDANT
OF SHEFFIELD SCIENTIFIC SCHOOL FOUNDER

WASHINGTON, March 17.—Miss Mabel Thorp Boardman, for many years national secretary of the American Red Cross, died tonight after an attack of coronary thrombosis.

FORTY-FOUR YEARS IN RED-CROSS WORK

Florence Nightingale holds a high place in history for her ministrations to the wounded on the battlefields of the Crimean War, which are said to have been the beginning of all trained nursing, and the beginning too of the Red Cross idea. Clara Barton, during the Civil War, brought the idea of ministering to soldier wounded a little nearer to realization.

But it remained for Mabel Thorp Boardman, during 44 years of wholly gratuitous and unceasing effort, to implement the great love of humanity these pioneer women displayed by building the American Red Cross, while helping to lay the foundation for the International Red Cross.

Many countries have honored her with special medals. In the earthquake of Tokyo and Messina, on the battlefields, in hospitals and prison camps of the First World War, during the Mississippi flood disaster, famine, depression-relief, the Spanish Revolution and in the widest-flung war in history, with its many complex and urgent humane needs, she provided much of the organization through which America's generosity has most effectively brought mercy and relief to the points where it was needed.

HONORED AT HER RETIREMENT

At a testimonial luncheon in Washington on December 13, 1944, upon her retirement from the general committee of the Red Cross, she received a gold medal specially designed for the occasion. The citation accompanying the medal sums up her service and talents in official language:

"Inspirer of the organization and administration of the Red Cross.

"Leader of men and women in the vision of the Red Cross as a national and international instrumentality of service.

"Practical idealist, tireless, loyal, wise, and constant. Possessed of many talents, she has devoted her life to one purpose—the American Red Cross."

Although even the Red Cross had no record of her age, she remarked in 1944 that she then was more than 80 years old.

Miss Boardman was born in Cleveland, the daughter of William Jarvis and Florence Sheffield Boardman. Her father's ancestors came from England in 1636 and settled in Connecticut. Her great-grandfather, Elijah Boardman, was a United States Senator from that State. Gen. John Mason, Colonial soldier and Indian fighter, was another Boardman ancestor.

Her maternal grandfather was Joseph Earl Sheffield, of New Haven, Conn., for whom the Sheffield Scientific School of Yale University is named, because of the aid he gave to it.

STUDIED HERE AND IN CLEVELAND

She was educated in private schools in Cleveland and New York, and then studied and traveled in Europe. William Walter Phelps, Minister to Germany from 1880 to 1893, had married her mother's sister, and the attractive young niece enjoyed much of the official and always military society of Berlin.

At the turn of the century she was dividing her residence with her family between Cleveland and Washington, and was doing welfare

work with children in both cities. But the record of the Red Cross during the Spanish-American War was being reviewed in Washington, and incorporation and national recognition for it were being recommended. Miss Boardman's name was included among the original incorporators, without her knowledge. This type of practical service appealed to her, and her interest in its needs started then.

By an official act of Congress in 1905 the society was reorganized and Miss Boardman became full-time secretary, the first and only employee, although she was not paid. Charitable at heart, and fervently patriotic, her intelligent ability was fired by these passions.

She worked incessantly at her desk, first in a one-room office, and later in the War Department. Much of her time was spent traveling from city to city organizing chapters and branches, which eventually spread into every small and large community in the country.

INSISTED ON HIGH STANDARDS

The high standards which Miss Boardman insisted upon, both as to character of women volunteers and thoroughness of training, had much to do with the organization's fine record for efficiency. The emblem and the uniform mean as much to many American soldiers as the flag itself.

In 1913, when America was not too aware of the approaching war in Europe, the Red Cross planned its official headquarters building in Washington. With some Government funds and a larger amount raised by public subscription, Miss Boardman persuaded the executives to buy a site on Seventeenth Street NW. A beautiful marble memorial building was erected, dedicated to the services of American women in the Civil War. The building was completed in 1917, when this country's participation in the war was getting into stride, and the Red Cross was expanded to its greatest dimensions up to that time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a telegram, a letter, and a resolution.

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therewith an editorial from the Indianapolis Star.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article entitled "Past and Present."

Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therein a copy of a speech made by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, on St. Patrick's Day in the city of Philadelphia.

WORK OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, bearing directly on the good and important work being done by the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives I want to give to the House and to the country a brief record of what the committee has done for the Nation between February 8, 1945, and

January 31, 1946. It received 1,189 requests for information from the following agencies of the Federal Government and has answered them from the material under its control:

Committee on Un-American Activities, number of requests for information at room 550, Feb. 8, 1945-Jan. 31, 1946

Government agency:	No. of requests
Alien Property Custodian.....	6
Civil Service Commission.....	95
Federal Bureau of Investigation.....	19
Federal Works Agency.....	21
Navy Department.....	26
Office of Price Administration.....	2
Office of Strategic Services.....	31
State Department.....	457
Treasury Department.....	273
War Department.....	257
War Manpower Commission.....	2
Total.....	1,189

This list gives to the country some idea of the splendid work being done by that committee. I want the Nation and the Congress to know of it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ADAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House today for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

WAR SCARE

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, last night I heard a broadcast by Upton Close, who said in substance that President Truman was trying to create a war scare in order to get votes for his program of keeping America strong and helping England.

Where have we heard that one before? We heard it in 1933, 1939, 1940, and 1941 from the Communists, the Roosevelt haters, the pacifists, and many sincere Americans who misread the signs of the times. They did not want America to be strong; they did not want us to help England, and they almost succeeded in their purposes.

Today we find the same old alibi. They are saying again that we do not need military, naval, and air strength. They are insisting that we leave England to work out her own salvation no matter what methods she pursues and what effect it has on UNO, world peace, or any other problem.

In those earlier times I had to fight that alliance and that viewpoint from the outside. I am glad that I can now

do it here where the decisions are to be made.

I am for a strong world organization and a powerful America to help make that organization function. I am for helping England to get back on her feet so that we can have free exchange of goods, services, and ideas, with a consequent promotion of prosperity—the only really effective way to fight communism, which breeds on poverty and discontent. I would like to have Henry Wallace know that.

Let those who take a different view read again the prewar debates on these same subjects and ask themselves whether they wish to be lined up with the same forces which almost succeeded in making our country helpless and without any allies when the blow fell at Pearl Harbor.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LATHAM addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. FALLON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from Service Stripe.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances; in one to include an article from the Milwaukee Journal, in another an editorial from the Washington News, in another an editorial from the Washington Evening Star, and in the fourth instance to include some testimony made before a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate on the St. Lawrence seaway.

GIFT-LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I have heard much about being friendly to Great Britain. I want to be Great Britain's friend. I have no reason to be against Great Britain. But I want to say, first, last, and all the time, that I want to be for America. America first, with me.

When the time comes that we say we are going to make a loan of \$3,750,000,000 to Great Britain, when we know that that loan is going to be a gift, if we are going to be honest about it, we ought to have enough manhood to stand here and say we are going to give them \$3,750,000,000. If you make a man a loan once and

he does not repay it, he may come back and ask you for another loan. If you grant that loan the second time and he does not pay it, what are you going to do when he comes for a third loan? You are going to say "No." That is what I say to Great Britain now.

Great Britain can make a loan through the regular banking connections of the two Governments. She can put up collateral for the loan and you know it then will be paid as the usual bank loans are paid. She does not want that. Great Britain wants a gift. We have no money to give away. Our taxpayers now have more of a burden than they can stand. We only wreck our own country to help Great Britain with this gift. We cannot afford that; we cannot make the gift, as a Government, without jeopardizing our own stability. This we, as a Nation, should not do. I will not be one to wreck America for any country in the world.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

COMMUNISTS IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Un-American Activities has given us some statistics today from the record of the State Department. I do not believe we could have 400 Communists in that organization. I do not believe in advertising this party and adding to their strength. I want to say that those members at least are not dues-paying members and no acclaimed Communists. They may at some time have expressed a belief in the interest of the common people. However, I object to the further advertising of the Communist Party on this floor.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY HOUSING FOR VETERANS

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1821) to amend section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, so as to authorize the appropriation of funds necessary to provide additional temporary housing units for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families, with House amendments, insist on the amendments of the House, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. LANHAM, Mr. BELL, Mr. BOYKIN, Mr. MCGREGOR, and Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania.

THANKS OF CONGRESS AND MEDALS TO GENERAL MARSHALL AND ADMIRAL KING

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 243, tendering the thanks of Congress to General of the Army George C. Marshall, and the members of the Army of the United States who have fought under his direction during the wars; and providing that the President of the United States shall cause a medal to be struck to be presented to General Marshall in the name of the people of the United States of America, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert "That the thanks of the Congress are hereby tendered to General of the Army George Catlett Marshall for his distinguished leadership, as Chief of Staff of the Army and as a member of the Combined Chiefs of Staff of the United Nations, in planning the expansion, equipment, training, and deployment of the great Army of the United States and in formulating and executing the global strategy that led to victory in World War II; and to the members of the Army of the United States who served under his direction with such heroic devotion and personal sacrifice.

"Sec. 2. That the thanks of the Congress are hereby tendered to Fleet Admiral Ernest Joseph King for his distinguished leadership, as commander in chief of the United States Fleet and Chief of Naval Operations and as a member of the Combined Chiefs of Staff of the United Nations, in planning the expansion, equipment, training, and operation of the United States Navy and in formulating and executing the global strategy that led to victory in World War II; and to the members of the United States Navy, the United States Marine Corps, and the United States Coast Guard and to the members of the Reserve Forces who served under his direction with such heroic devotion and personal sacrifice.

"Sec. 3. The President of the United States is requested to cause gold medals to be struck, with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, in General Marshall's and Admiral King's honor. When the medals have been prepared, the President is requested to present them to General Marshall and Admiral King, together with a copy of this joint resolution engrossed on parchment, in the name of the people of the United States.

"Sec. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sum as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution."

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution tendering the thanks of Congress to General of the Army George Catlett Marshall and to Fleet Admiral Ernest Joseph King and to the members of the armed forces of the United States who served under their direction; and providing for the striking and presentation to General Marshall and Fleet Admiral King of appropriate gold medals in the name of the people of the United States."

Mr. MAY (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with. I will make an explanation of

just what the Senate amendment does and I am confident there will be no objection.

The only thing the Senate amendment does is to include in the provisions of the House joint resolution the Admiral of the Fleet, Ernest J. King, under the same terms and conditions as General Marshall. In other words, this resolution tenders the thanks of Congress and the American people to General George C. Marshall, General of the Armies and Chief of Staff during the war, and awards a medal to him in the name of the people of the United States, and through him as the General of the Armies and the Chief of Staff, to the men under him. The Senate amendment does the same thing with regard to Admiral King and the brave men of the Navy who served under him. Surely no one would grant to the leader of the Army, genuinely entitled thereto, and to his men, such deserved recognition, and withhold the same honors from the leaders and men of the other service like recognition.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this action agreeable to the other members of the Military Affairs Committee?

Mr. MAY. Yes; it is. I have consulted with them.

Mr. ARENDS. Yes; it is.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, my only objection is that they did not include a Congressional Medal of Honor to the greatest general of this war, George S. Patton.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TABER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

THE SOVIET RADIO STATION IN THE PENTAGON BUILDING

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I read in the newspaper a statement that the Soviet radio station in the Pentagon Building has been granted a 3 months' extension of life. This is a three-band transmitter which transmits thousands and thousands of coded words between Washington and Moscow. Although the war is over, Under Secretary Acheson is said to have insisted upon this, notwithstanding there has been heavy opposition in the War Department to the continuance of its operation.

It seems to me the operation of this station requires a thorough investigation on the part of the Foreign Affairs Committee. It is about time we found

out whether those who are looking after our foreign affairs have their first loyalty to the interests of the United States.

COMMUNISTS IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise to correct the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GALLAGHER].

The gentleman from Michigan, who was criticized by the gentleman from Minnesota, at no time said that the Committee on Un-American Activities had stated there were 450 Communists in the State Department. What the gentleman from Michigan did say was that 450 agents of the State Department had called upon the office of the Committee on Un-American Activities in order to look into our files for one purpose or another. The gentleman from Michigan all the way through his remarks was stating that various agents of the Government had called upon the Committee on Un-American Activities to look into the files for the period from February 5, 1945, to date.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLACKNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the State Journal of Lansing, Mich.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address he is to deliver over WMAL tonight answering attacks on the Committee on Un-American Activities.

MEDALS OF HONOR

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago the House passed a bill authorizing medals of honor to be struck for that great leader of the American forces in the recent war, Gen. George C. Marshall, which I heartily approve.

Last June I introduced bills to authorize special medals of honor for Generals Pershing, Eisenhower, and MacArthur. These bills have been before the Military Affairs Committee since that time but I have been unable to get any action except that I received a letter from the chairman of the subcommittee considering the bills stating that it was not the policy of the Military Affairs Committee to pass on matters of that kind; however, since the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs is present and has presented the bill which was just enacted into law, I desire to ask that reconsideration be given to my bills which have been introduced because all of the other countries of the world have given Gen-

erals Pershing, Eisenhower, and MacArthur all of the honors of their country, I think they also are entitled to the highest honors that this country can bestow upon them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

THE LATE HARRIS DICKSON

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the relentless messenger that never tires and never wearies has again knocked upon the door of an outstanding American and a distinguished citizen of Mississippi. Harris Dickson, the noted author, has been called to his eternal reward. He passed away at his house in Vicksburg, on last Sunday at the age of 77.

Many of you will remember Harris Dickson as the creator of Old Reliable in the Saturday Evening Post a few decades ago.

It has been said that Joel Chandler Harris, of Georgia, the creator of Uncle Remus, was the greatest folklore philosopher since Aesop.

We all knew and loved Irvin Cobb, of Kentucky, the creator of Judge Priest.

In their class was Harris Dickson, the creator of Old Reliable through whom he did more to present to the world the virtues, vices, and natural characteristics of the average Negro of the South than any other man of this generation.

We bid him farewell in his own immortal lines:

Its faith in the strength of the men who do,
And in the skill of the men who say—
That gives hope to each that all will reach
Home safely at the end of the day.

DOMESTIC RAISING OF FUR-BEARING ANIMALS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 544 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2115) relating to the domestic raising of fur-bearing animals. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later on I shall yield 30 minutes to my colleague from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Speaker, this is not a very important bill to many Members; nevertheless

it is an important one to certain sections of the country.

House Resolution 544 makes in order consideration of a bill, H. R. 2115, introduced by the hard-working gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER]. It provides for 1 hour of general debate and then the bill will be read under the 5-minute rule, at which time any germane amendments will be in order. The agricultural interests are all in favor of this bill which provides for transferring power and jurisdiction relative to fur-bearing animals from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture; not furbearing but fur-bearing animals.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MAY. I am very happy to have the distinguished gentleman of the Committee on Rules allude to our colleague, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER], as being a very hard-working man. I would like to add that he is a very able and capable Representative of his district; that he is not only a hard-working man, but he is diligent and eternally on the job on behalf of his constituents.

Mr. SABATH. I did intend to say that, but the gentleman from Kentucky said it much better than I possibly could. He is all that the gentleman says he is, and I know that he is beloved and appreciated by all of us here for the splendid service which he is rendering to the country. Not only has he appeared before the Committee on Rules urging and pleading for the passage of this legislation, but the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] has also appeared in favor of the rule and the passage of the bill.

Many of us do not know much about fur-bearing animals, but this is a new industry in this country, and I think it should receive all the cooperation and aid that we can give it. I concede that I do not know about all the fur-bearing animals that are described, and the authority for that will be transferred to the Department of Agriculture. I am familiar with the value of hares, and I suggest to those gentlemen and others that they should immediately breed more hares because of the value not only of the meat, but of the skin. Consequently, I congratulate those who are interested and who I hope will bring about a situation that will improve the breed and also the quantity and quality of these rabbits or hares. I know that in many sections of the world hare meat is a specialty and is recognized as the finest meat, even preferable to the finest lamb or young goat meat. So I feel that this legislation, though it may appear to be of no great importance to many of us, will be of real benefit to the entire Nation, because it may be the medium which will overcome the shortage of meat within a few years; a shortage from which we have been suffering at times.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

If I may be permitted to make an observation I will do so. Yesterday the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] criticized the former Vice President, the present Secretary of Commerce,

Personally, I think Mr. Wallace is a splendid gentleman, an honorable, honest, and sincere man. Though I have the utmost confidence in him, I cannot quite agree with all that he has proposed, because I think the course he suggested will not be necessary. The gentlemen he has criticized I know are Democrats and will again join with the party which should be dear to them, because they were elected on the Democratic ticket and by right should cooperate with the party of which they are members to bring about that unity and cooperation which will be helpful to them as well as to the entire Nation.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Why, of course I shall.

Mr. COX. I think the gentleman from Mississippi has been wasting a good deal of ammunition, for when I go out hunting I never cock my gun at a sparrow. As for myself, I would pay absolutely no attention to the speech of a dunce like Mr. Wallace.

Mr. SABATH. That remark is unfair. Surely he is not a dunce and any man who takes him for one aims badly. I know the gentleman from Georgia is a good huntsman and goes gunning very often. He may be capable of bringing down a lot of game; but none will be as big and brave as that he has just shot at; and not all of his aiming and sniping can bring this game down. But I hope that he and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and others will forget that statement of the Secretary of Commerce, and not give others the opportunity to criticize and call attention to what he referred to as a "coalition." May I not urge, and I do urge, most sincerely, that we forget our differences and cooperate more harmoniously as the party entrusted by the American people with guidance of our national destinies in this hour of supreme responsibility for the world's future; and let us strive for world-wide peace, which, however, must require peace at home.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking in order on this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. SABATH. I feel that all these fur-bearing animals that are provided for include perhaps many other animals that are not included in the bill. And, of course, Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the educational possibilities—it is well known that rabbits multiply rapidly. I do not know whether the gentleman from Illinois is familiar with all of the many fur-bearing animals we have in this country because they do not seem to be designated specifically. Of course, there are a great many of them. Some of them are dangerous and many of them are not fur-bearing animals. But they are not included in this bill so I would not delude the membership on that score.

In conclusion, may I say that this legislation is not aimed at giving any additional great power to the Secretary of Agriculture who is a capable and able gentleman who will I know assume the additional duties in a manner satisfactory to the gentleman from Utah, the

gentleman from California, and all others interested in helping the development of an industry which I know will benefit the country.

With that statement, Mr. Speaker, I conclude my discussion of the rule, having confined my remarks, as I always do, to the rule which is before the House for consideration, though I cannot resist the temptation at times to deviate from the subject under discussion to enlighten the House on matters which I believe are timely and of importance.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there is no objection to the adoption of the rule on this side of the aisle.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2115) relating to the domestic raising of fur-bearing animals.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2115, with Mr. OUTLAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple matter. I regret that we have been compelled to take up the time of the House on this bill. We endeavored to have the bill passed by unanimous consent but were unable to do so, and this is the only method that we can pursue. This bill proposes to do two things, and two things only. First, it defines and declares certain fur-bearing animals as domestic animals and declares that the raising of such animals constitutes a farming and agricultural pursuit. Secondly, all the functions of the Department of the Interior with relation to the raising of such fur-bearing animals are transferred from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture.

As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] stated, perhaps this is not such an important bill, but it has more importance than many Members may realize. The raising of domestic fur-bearing animals and rabbits is practiced in every State of the Union, and in some States it is a major agricultural pursuit. Such States, for instance, as Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. There should be no opposition to this bill. It comes from our committee with a unanimous report. It simply provides for the two things I have mentioned. I do not know that there is any opposition to the bill.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. I have been receiving quite a number of letters from people

in my district who raise rabbits. All of their letters express the desire for a higher tariff rate on the importation of competitive articles from other countries. This bill does not touch that in any way, does it?

Mr. GRANGER. No; it does not, except indirectly. I think the gentleman is talking about Angora rabbit wool?

Mr. VURSELL. Yes.

Mr. GRANGER. Of course, this bill would have the effect of declaring that kind of a rabbit or the raising of that kind of a rabbit to be an agricultural pursuit. It would help in that direction, because it would have a standing with some department and would be an agricultural pursuit.

Mr. VURSELL. Because of your interest in this matter, I thought you would know if there is any other bill pending before the House or any committee now that has been introduced for the purpose of raising the tariff on rabbit wool. Frankly, I ask that question for the purpose of securing information.

Mr. GRANGER. I will say I have had some inquiries similar to that which the gentleman has received. There is a bill that was offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Doyne] that would do what the gentleman is asking about.

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. PITTINGER. Has there been any criticism of the way Mr. Ickes or some of his subordinates conducted the Department of the Interior with reference to these fur-bearing animals? Is that the reason for the transfer?

Mr. GRANGER. No. I have heard no complaint whatsoever.

The House will remember, of course, that prior to the departmental reorganization that was effected several years ago this agency was in Agriculture. Under the reorganization program it was transferred to Interior, and it has been there ever since. Even so, the people who are administering this act think it could be administered just as well in the Department of Agriculture. At the same time, they are satisfied with it where it is in the Interior.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I think this is a very commendable piece of legislation, and it will have my unqualified support. I am wondering why, in enumerating the list of fur-bearing animals, the beaver were left out?

Mr. GRANGER. This bill is confined solely to domestic fur-bearing animals in captivity. The beaver is a wild animal.

Mr. WHITE. It would be very easy to go into the business of raising beaver. I notice you have muskrats in here, and they have practically the same habits.

Mr. GRANGER. They are entirely different.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

The beaver is in an entirely different field. This bill does not contemplate going into the field of wildlife whatso-

ever. We want to take domestic animals that are in captivity, that are farming activities, and put them in the Department of Agriculture, and leave wildlife and fish and deer exactly where they are.

Mr. WHITE. I am in favor of the gentleman's position, but I cannot distinguish between beaver and muskrats, when you talk about wildlife. If one can be domesticated, why not the other?

Mr. GRANGER. Well, beaver are not. Muskrats are. They are real farming, as any other farming activity is carried on.

Mr. WHITE. Would the gentleman be willing to accept an amendment to include beaver, to be left discretionary with the individual, of course?

Mr. GRANGER. No; I would object to that.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to point out that the language of the bill mentions specifically certain fur-bearing animals, and says, "all other fur-bearing animals raised in captivity for breeding or other useful purposes." In other words, the criterion that the bill sets up is the question of whether the animals are raised in captivity.

Mr. GRANGER. As far as I know beaver have not been raised in captivity.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I want the gentleman to know that I appreciate the great amount of work he has put in on this particular measure. I believe it is an important measure. I rose to my feet to bring out what the gentleman from California [Mr. Voorhis] has stated, that I believe the answer to the question raised by the gentleman from Idaho is found right in the bill as written.

Mr. WHITE. I may say to the gentleman and to the House that State game wardens are profiting by going in on private land, trapping the beaver, and making a regular business out of it. I do not know why the farmer who pays taxes on his land and supports the place should not be permitted to raise some beaver if he wants to keep them in captivity.

Mr. GRANGER. There is nothing to prohibit anyone from doing that very thing if they want to under this bill if they are raised in captivity and are domestic animals. That is very clear.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I want to emphasize what the gentleman has already said and what was so well stated by the gentleman from California [Mr. Voorhis]. I believe the statements of these two gentlemen answer completely the objection that has been made by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. White], in that the bill reads "and all other fur-bearing animals raised in captivity."

Mr. GRANGER. Yes.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. If the beaver in which the gentleman from Idaho is interested are raised in captivity

as these other fur-bearing animals are, then they certainly come within the provisions of the bill.

This bill which is now before the House has real merit in its effort to establish a new and rapidly growing industry. The raising of domestic rabbits for the production of fur and as a highly nutritious meat has become an important branch of American agriculture. The producers of rabbits are farmers, like poultry farmers and other producers of livestock. Therefore it naturally belongs in the Department of Agriculture.

It is an industry rapidly increasing in importance in the district I represent as well as in many other parts of the country.

I hope the bill will have the favorable support of the House.

Mr. GRANGER. I think the bill entirely covers that. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ALMOND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. ALMOND. I am heartily in favor of the bill, but I wish to be sure I understand one portion of it. As I understand, this does not involve the creation of any separate bureau or agency to administer the functions of the bill, nor does it involve any appropriation.

Mr. GRANGER. The gentleman is correct; it does not create any additional agency or require any further appropriation; in fact, the committee went to the extent of ascertaining from the Department of Agriculture what their practice would be if this legislation were passed. We were given the assurance, and I think rightly so, that the activity simply would be taken over and it would not cause the creation of any new bureau or require any additional appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. GILLIE. I believe this is a rather important bill. The people in my district are very vitally interested in this transfer because we have one of the largest fur-bearing industries in my district. We are particularly interested in rabbits. We have a great many growers there. Some of them have as many as 100 or 150 hutches of various kinds of rabbit.

I wish to support this bill, and my folks back home are very much interested in this bill. Inasmuch as it will not require any extra money or further appropriation to make this transfer I am heartily in favor of having this bill passed just as it is.

Mr. GRANGER. I thank the gentleman and I hope the Committee will pass the bill without much debate.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. Granger], author of this bill, has made a very able presentation of the material body of this bill and has clearly

stated its provisions. I cannot see why there should be any objection to this measure, because of the rapid growth of this industry in the past few years.

Mr. Chairman, something has been said about rabbits. There was testimony presented before our committee that last year in one county alone in California there were produced \$6,000,000 worth of rabbits. That has become a great food industry, therefore it belongs under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture.

There has also been mentioned the production of Angora rabbits because of the wool, which is like the wool of the Angora goat, for which there is quite a market in this country. May I say to those gentlemen who have referred to some kind of a tariff, that there should be some protection for these growers, and I agree with them, but this is not the time or place upon which we should attach any such tariff measure.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons for this bill being before us this morning has not been mentioned as yet. That is the small-farm or truck-garden owner in many places throughout this Nation has gone into the production of rabbits not only for fur but for food. What we had in mind was to transfer this activity back to the Department of Agriculture so that these folks who need information as to the way to feed and care for these fur-bearing animals can get the information through the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, I do not represent the city of Denver, in Colorado. That is District No. 1. However, my district does completely surround the city of Denver, coming up to the city limits of Denver on all four sides. It is probably the only congressional district in the United States completely surrounded by another congressional district. I get hundreds and hundreds of letters every spring, some throughout the year, inquiring as to how to care for and make money out of these rabbit hutches. The Department, in my opinion, has issued very fine bulletins on this subject, which give some very excellent information on how to feed and how to care for rabbits.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. HENRY. Is it not true also that most all of the people raising fur-bearing animals in this country favor the legislation that we are attempting to pass here today?

Mr. HILL. That is exactly right. Those folks who are producing fur are in favor of this bill. Mr. Chairman, let me add further that we are going to have a considerable number of boys return from this war, many of whom cannot do the active, hard work necessary to take care of a poultry ranch. However, in many instances they could take care of rabbit hutches.

I would like to impress upon the Members of the House this morning that it is important this little change be made so

that these veterans may get the necessary information from the Department of Agriculture in connection with the care of these animals. We have in my State fur-bearing ranches at this time producing fox and other fur-bearing animals, and, in answer to the gentleman from Idaho, who referred to beaver, may I say that our State fish and wildlife organization is now promoting plans to start experimental farms in connection with the production of beaver fur. This bill would classify those under domestic fur-bearing animals.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. It is the intention, as I understand it, to make this bill apply to all kinds and types of fur-bearing animals which are mentioned and which are raised in captivity for fur and other purposes?

Mr. HILL. As I understand this bill, as soon as you take over a fur-bearing animal and raise him in captivity, then he immediately comes under this bill. In other words, as soon as we begin to grow and produce them in captivity they come under this bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. Under the provisions of the bill as written I do not believe the gentleman is going to attain just that result.

Mr. HILL. What change would the gentleman suggest?

Mr. SPRINGER. For instance, in lines 6, 7, and 8 it provides that:

Fox, rabbit, mink, chinchilla, marten, fisher, muskrat, karakul, and all other fur-bearing animals—

I think the comma ought to come out and it ought to be replaced following the word "animals." Then those particular animals will apply to those in captivity for breeding and other purposes, and I think then you will accomplish the purpose you intend.

Mr. HILL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think the legislative intent should be very clear that it is the purpose of this bill to transfer to the Department of Agriculture and to designate as domestic animals only those animals which are raised under domestic conditions on a farm by a farmer, and that the criterion to be established is the circumstance under which the animal is raised rather than the type of animal that it is.

Mr. HILL. That is entirely correct. I am sure that the gentleman in charge of the bill would have no objection to an amendment which would satisfy those who question what this section means.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Of course, I am in favor of this bill, but I want to express the hope that the passage of this bill will not be an incentive to the organization of a number of these silver-fox farms or rabbit farms, or what have you, for the simple reason that the raising of silver foxes a few years ago developed into one of the worst rackets in the country. There were a number of them in my district. Corporations were organized; stock was sold. For instance, the man who owned the stock would own a pair of silver foxes, and then he was to receive a certain part of the increase as well as the proceeds thereof. This bill is intended to help the honest-to-God farmer who wants to raise these animals, but it should not be made an incentive for racketeering companies to prey upon the people, especially the veterans, in selling them stock in fur-bearing farms.

Mr. HILL. I thank the gentleman from Michigan. I might say this, that some good has come out of what the gentleman complains of. At our State agricultural college we have a department that conducts experiments and has been doing work on fox fur farming for years, and some fine results have been obtained.

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. GILLESPIE. I understand some of the producers of Angora rabbit wool have expressed a preference that this industry stay under the jurisdiction of the Department of Interior. Of course, this is a new industry and is developing rapidly and is a line of endeavor that is attracting many of the returning servicemen and I think it should have every protection possible. It is an infant industry in every sense of the word and should have protection against foreign competition.

Mr. HILL. I would say this to the gentleman from Colorado that this Angora rabbit wool raising industry is just in its infancy. In my home town of Fort Collins we have a man who has been spending most of his time in introducing and working with the boys and girls in that part of Colorado in promoting the Angora rabbit wool activity. They are doing quite well and feel their opportunities in this field are growing rapidly.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Contrary to what the gentleman from Colorado was stating to the gentleman, the mail I have received on this Angora-rabbit wool proposition is that the growers want this activity transferred from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture. I think the gentleman is mistaken on that.

Mr. HILL. I think the gentleman from Utah is entirely correct. The letters I have had from the Angora people are along this line. They are afraid that after the war is over we are liable to have the Japanese going back into the producing of this Angora wool.

They had a corner on it for many years. The producers seem to think that if we could get a little tariff for their protection we might be able really to develop an Angora-rabbit wool production activity in this country that would really be quite an industry.

Mr. GRANGER. Of course, the matter of the tariff does not enter into this legislation at all.

Mr. HILL. No; nor could it be a part of it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I say that my own mail, which is rather heavy from the producers of Angora wool, has been universally in favor of this transfer. It seems to me quite apparent that from the point of view of the interest of the producers of a so-called agricultural commodity of that kind their best interest lies in their being in the Department of Agriculture and having their product considered an agricultural product.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman from California is entirely correct, because even in this Angora rabbit wool production the rabbit itself is a real food product after the wool has been plucked from the rabbit.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. They have the benefit here of the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture. Will they not also have the benefit of the lending agencies such as the Production Credit Associations? Is not that somewhat the motive behind it?

Mr. HILL. The rabbit industry is so small and so inconsequential from the standpoint of borrowing money that most of these boys and girls and the veterans who wish to get into the rabbit business do not need to borrow any money from anyone.

In closing, may I say that I am supporting this measure 100 percent. I hope no one objects to it. We do not need to consider the matter further. This activity should have been kept in the Department of Agriculture in the first instance. I hope everyone will support this measure.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I was in part responsible for preventing this bill being considered on the Consent Calendar. My objection to the bill is that we have passed a reorganization act giving the President power to reorganize the executive branch of the Government. It is a good act. It is the best act of its kind we ever passed. I can qualify as a competent witness because I have been on every reorganization committee in this House for the last 18 years.

Yesterday we passed a bill setting up an agency having to do with loans and credits to farmers, the service rendered to those engaged in agriculture. There was not a line in that bill that provided

anything the President could not do under the powers we granted him in the reorganization act. There is not a line in this bill that the President cannot do under the powers we gave him in the reorganization act.

The Biological Survey was at one time in the Department of Agriculture, until the Fish and Wildlife Service was created in the Department of the Interior. At the last hearing we held before the Committee on Conservation of Wildlife, of which I am a member, it developed that there are seven agencies of the Government performing functions that properly belong to the Fish and Wildlife Service. The Biological Survey, of the Fish and Wildlife Service, is the one that is rendering service in connection with this industry. I know it is growing. I know just as well as you do that this industry is expanding, and it should expand. But I think we should let the President of the United States reorganize his own branch of Government now that we have given him the power, and not be passing legislation of this character.

In response to the gentleman from Colorado, let me say that I receive just as much mail as he does from people desiring information in reference to raising fur-bearing animals, including rabbits.

I do not have the least trouble in securing the literature desired from the Fish and Wildlife Service. It takes a little longer now because the office is temporarily located in Chicago, but when it was located here you could get that literature in 24 hours or 48 hours at the most. I see no reason for the passage of legislation of this kind, when the President has the power to put the agencies where he wants to put them. He can put it in the Department of Agriculture if he desires. I maintain that, although these animals are raised on the farms, there is no reason why the Fish and Wildlife Service cannot give the people the information. The fact of the matter is that you will either set up a biological survey in the Department of Agriculture to handle this matter or the Department of Agriculture will have the Fish and Wildlife agency service this department.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. Of course, the gentleman knows that this bill would not in any way interfere with the reorganization program of the President. If this procedure is wrong, the President has ample opportunity to correct it before it becomes law and he has the authority to reorganize the departments even if this bill does become law. The gentleman mentioned that there was not anything that the President could not do. Here is something that the President cannot do. On page 2, line 1, after the enumeration of these fur-bearing animals, the bill states that the Congress of the United States declares the raising of them to be an agricultural pursuit. The President cannot do that.

Mr. COCHRAN. What difference does it make if they are declared to be agricultural pursuit or some other kind of

pursuit? That is not going to have anything to do with the price or the raising of the animals.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. HENRY. If this is good legislation, what is the difference if we pass it as we are attempting to do here or wait for the President to act?

Mr. COCHRAN. Why do you not give the President the time to act; and if he does not act, then consider the bill?

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ALMOND].

Mr. ALMOND. Mr. Chairman, I have studied the report on this bill and have studied the bill very carefully. It seems to me to be a very salutary piece of legislation. It calls for no appropriation and creates no new department or bureau, but merely transfers jurisdiction of this work from the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture in order that this growing and important industry may have the benefit of the splendid facilities that the Department of Agriculture now has to administer to its sound and progressive growth. I cannot understand why it has been referred to as a minor piece of legislation. I think it is vital legislation. One important matter that suggests itself to my mind specifically is with reference to the prevalence of the disease among wild rabbits in the South known as tularemia. The wild or game rabbit will soon be extinct. The husbandry of domestic rabbits is growing rapidly to be a very vital and important industry in this country. It will open up new avenues of opportunity and sources of income for the assistance of many people who can raise rabbits on their farms. The Department of Agriculture has facilities with reference to the propagation of these animals as well as information to help people raise them in a healthy condition. This is a great industry and can be put on a high level. I think the legislation is important and I hope it passes.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALMOND. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. I have received a large number of communications from veterans who desire to engage in this business. I am certain the gentleman from Virginia has also received a number of communications on that subject.

Mr. ALMOND. That is true.

Mr. SPRINGER. This measure merely transfers this from the Wildlife Division of the Interior Department to the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. ALMOND. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think that would be a very wholesome act in respect to the administration of this particular business.

Mr. ALMOND. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ALMOND] has again expired.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to prolong the discussion of this legislation. The thing I cannot understand is why it should be necessary to discuss the matter at all. It seems apparent on its face, certainly it is apparent to any person who has any acquaintance at all with the raising of fur-bearing animals, that it is an agricultural activity, and therefore the only proper, sane, and sound place for it to be is in the Department of Agriculture.

Statements have been made to the effect that it is an infant industry. Certainly it is an infant industry, but it has already reached proportions where in some sections it constitutes a very real and important part of the agricultural economy of the State. That is true particularly in the State of Wisconsin, where even in its infancy this industry has reached very astounding proportions, and constitutes a very big factor in the agricultural economy of that State.

I hope this legislation will be enacted. I certainly do not feel that the argument presented by the gentleman from Missouri, namely that because the President has been granted the power to reorganize, therefore we should not act, goes to the merits of this legislation. This reorganization is necessary. It is advisable and meritorious. Therefore, there is absolutely no reason for waiting just because the power to reorganize has been given to somebody else. It should have been done long ago. It certainly should be done now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], has expired.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, no doubt you all know that Louisiana is the largest fur producing State in the United States, and my district is the largest muskrat producing district in the United States. I have submitted the bill under consideration to the Commissioner of Conservation of Louisiana, and other interested parties in my district. They have no objection to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important measure to a significant group of American farmers. It is a very logical measure, as has been said by a number of Members, and there is not any reason why there should be the slightest question about its passing.

The gentleman from Missouri made the argument to the effect that we passed a reorganization bill and should leave the matter to the President. Even though we have passed a reorganization bill, if Congress knows a certain move is right and is the sound course to pursue, we should go ahead and do it. I

see no reason why we should wait for a very uncertain possibility that the President will transfer this work from one department to the other.

The whole purpose of this bill is very simple. The purpose of the bill is to get certain government services to a branch of Agriculture, which are now under the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, over into the Department of Agriculture where they belong.

In my section of California the raising of domestic rabbits has become an important industry. During the war it was one of our major sources of meat. It is so today and will continue to be. In one year, in 1945, 4,000,000 animals were marketed in Los Angeles county alone, with a value of \$6,000,000 for the meat alone, without regard to the value for the fur. The men who produce those animals are farmers, just exactly like poultry farmers and other livestock farmers. One gentleman asked the question as to what difference it makes whether these animals are described as domestic animals, and their products as agricultural products. I can answer that it makes all the difference in the world.

To a farmer, the services of the Extension Service and other services of the Department of Agriculture are of extreme importance, and for one group of farmers to be shut out from the possibility of having the advantage of those services just does not make good sense.

I wish to read one short paragraph from the California Rabbit Magazine, which, of course, speaks for this industry. It reads:

The rabbit industry is rapidly becoming one of the larger meat-producing businesses in this section of the country. It is probably the largest fur-producing business and the only short Angora wool-producing industry we have. Compared with other agricultural industries, the rabbit business has no more right being in the Department of the Interior than the Coast Guard has. Why should an industry that produces food and clothing be put under the same head as snakes, turtles, skunks, and fish?

That is the way our people feel about the matter.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the old WPA days the Government went so far as to consider the trapping of wild muskrats in Louisiana a farming industry, and I think properly so.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I agree with the gentleman.

I have in my hand a petition signed by several hundred rabbit producers all over these United States. This petition is in support of this bill. I have all kinds of correspondence universally in support of the bill. Last summer I attended the State convention of rabbit producers in my State, which convention was unanimously in support of this legislation.

The research work that is carried on in the field of domestic animals is carried on by the Department of Agriculture. It ought to be a saving to make this transfer. A great deal of that research work is carried on using these very animals as

subjects for it; and why in the world should we not have in the Department of Agriculture the services to farmers who are encompassed in this bill?

The Farm Bureau Federation has indicated their support of the bill. We made a couple of amendments to the bill in accordance with their suggestion.

The Grange is in support of the bill and has so testified. All the other farm organizations as far as I am aware are in support of this bill.

Legislation such as this as a matter of fact should have been passed even before this. I want to say for my part that I appreciate very deeply the interest that the Members of the Committee on Agriculture have taken in the bill, the hard work that the author of the bill, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] has done; and I know that the farmers who will be affected by the bill and who hope for its passage would want me to say that to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. GILLESPIE].

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Chairman, the production of Angora rabbit wool is comparatively new in the United States, although it has been carried on in Japan and Europe for a number of years. My own State of Colorado is particularly well adapted for the growing of this wool because the average altitude of that State is the highest in the United States and the cool nights cause the rabbits to grow heavy pelts, and while the yield for a single rabbit is low, the price of wool is very high. This is a line of business that can be engaged in successfully by men who are partially disabled and is being eagerly sought after by returning veterans.

I have had many letters from veterans stating that they want to engage in the production of Angora rabbit wool and are asking that a tariff be placed on this commodity to protect them from cheap Japanese or European imports. One letter I received, reads as follows:

DENVER, COLO., February 25, 1946.

DEAR SIR: We are writing you at this time asking your full cooperation on passing of bill H. R. 5368, the taxing of Angora rabbit wool and yarn coming into this country from foreign trade.

The Angora rabbit is becoming big business in this country, and it can stay big business providing we can get this bill passed, but we cannot compete with foreign labor.

I am an ex-serviceman having met with an accident after leaving the service, losing all four fingers from my right hand, which makes me want to become more and more independent. We believe the Angora rabbit can give us this chance and many, many veterans of this last war, providing we can get this bill passed.

Thanking you,

Mr. and Mrs. CYRIL L. FISH.

This is a sample of many letters I have received. H. R. 5368 has been introduced by the Honorable CLYDE DOYLE, of California, for the purpose of affording such protection and I hope when we come to that bill that the request of these returning veterans, as well as thousands of others, engaged in this new and in-

fant industry will be taken into consideration.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I know of no further requests for time and ask that the Clerk read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of all acts of Congress, Executive orders, administrative orders, and regulations—

(a) fox, rabbit, mink, chinchilla, marten, fisher, muskrat, karakul, and all other fur-bearing animals raised in captivity for breeding or other useful purposes shall be deemed domestic animals;

(b) such animals and the products thereof shall be deemed agricultural products; and

(c) the breeding, raising, producing, or marketing of such animals shall be deemed an agricultural pursuit.

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 3, after the word "of", insert "classification and administration of."

The amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 5, after the word "regulations", insert "pertaining to—"

The amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 4, after the word "animals", insert "or their products by the producer."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER: Page 1, line 7, after the word "karakul", strike out the comma; and insert a comma after the word "animals" at the end of line 7.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have just offered will, I am certain, clarify and lend material assistance to the pending bill, H. R. 2115. The bill, in its present and original form, in lines 6, 7, 8, and 9, on page 1, would create confusion as to whether the legislative intent is to limit "all other fur-bearing animals" to those "raised in captivity," or as to whether the provision "raised in captivity" will apply to those fur-bearing animals which are specifically mentioned in that portion of the pending bill. I am confident that much confusion would develop if the bill should be passed in its original form, and without the insertion of the amendment which I have offered. That very uncertain condition, which would doubtless create confusion in the future, should be corrected now, and for the purpose of entirely clarifying and making specific and certain, this very material question, I have offered the amendment in line 7, page 1, to strike out the comma following the word "karakul", and to insert a comma after the word "animals" at the end of line 7, and with the adoption of that amendment all of the animals named in subdivision (a), on page 1, including "all other fur-bearing animals," will be controlled by the provision, which follows "raised in captivity." This is, as I understand from the members of the subcommittee having this measure in charge, the express intention of both the subcommittee and of the full committee upon this subject. That intention being that the fur-bearing animals which come within the provisions of this bill must be those which are "raised in captivity for breeding or other useful purposes shall be deemed

domestic animals." My amendment will clarify this measure and make certain the intent which is here desired.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to have the opportunity to support this measure. Quite recently I have received many communications from returning veterans and from the people in the district which I have the honor to represent, all of whom desire to engage in the business of producing fur-bearing animals. It is my considered judgment that the transfer of this particular item of business from the fur-bearing animal section of the Department of the Interior to the Agricultural Department is both desirable and expedient. As a matter of fact this particular business, which relates to those animals raised in captivity and which are deemed to be domestic animals, should properly come within the purview of the Department of Agriculture. To all of us, I am certain, this transfer will meet with entire approval and unanimous endorsement.

May I compliment the members of the subcommittee for bringing before the House this measure which is so desirable, and which will be found to be wholesome in the future. Especially I desire to compliment the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHNSON], and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] for the splendid work they have done in connection with this legislation, and for their painstaking efforts in presenting this legislation to the House. They have rendered an outstanding service in a worthy cause.

Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that the amendment which I have offered will be passed, thereby clarifying this measure and making clear and certain the intention of the committee, and that this measure will be passed by the unanimous vote of the Members of the House. I am confident this legislation, when enacted into law, will be found to be helpful and very beneficial.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, this is a desirable amendment and the committee will accept it.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITE: Page 1, line 7, after the word "karakul", insert the word "beaver."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, if we are going to enumerate the animals to be domesticated, those that can be propagated, I suggest that beaver be included also. I live in a country where beaver had practically become extinct, but now are gradually increasing, having been fostered by the State and Federal Governments, and through protective laws have become rather plentiful.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. Does not the gentleman believe that the language in line 7, page 1, reading "and all other fur-bearing animals" includes the beaver?

Mr. WHITE. That is subject to interpretation by the wildlife and game peo-

ple. There is a question whether beaver is included.

Mr. SPRINGER. But beaver is a fur-bearing animal.

Mr. WHITE. Beaver is a fur-bearing animal, yes, and it ought to be propagated in these United States.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Is beaver grown in captivity?

Mr. WHITE. They can be grown in captivity just the same as muskrats.

Mr. COOLEY. Maybe they can, but are they?

Mr. WHITE. That is a question. I believe they are grown in captivity. I do not know whether they are grown commercially or not, but I see them in parks, zoos, or in a great many other places.

Mr. COOLEY. Are they grown for commercial purposes?

Mr. WHITE. They are out in my country. Out in Idaho last year a farmer trapped 60 beaver under the auspices of the State and he got \$38 as his share for each of those beaver. If there is anything that should be propagated and anything that will boost the fur trade it is the beaver pelt. I contend that the way should be opened for the farmers of this country to maintain their land and to raise these beaver, domesticate and propagate them for fur purposes. That is the object of my amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. I am not arguing with the gentleman whether it would be a good or bad thing. I was wondering what the present situation is with reference to the growing of beaver in captivity.

Mr. WHITE. If there is any merit to this bill at all, then there is merit in the amendment I have offered.

Mr. Chairman, beaver produces some of the most valuable fur that we have in the fur trade. If we are going to propagate fur-bearing animals at all it seems to me we should not exclude one of the most valuable animals we have in our country. I do not see why the committee cannot accept the amendment. It only inserts the word "beaver," and if anyone wants to propagate beaver I do not know why the door should be closed to them.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that my amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. Chairman, in the first place I doubt whether or not the amendment is germane because this bill deals exclusively with those animals that are now raised in captivity and those animals which are domesticated; furthermore, the language of this bill would take care of the situation that the gentleman from Idaho enumerates, in that it applies to fur-bearing animals in captivity. If, as the gentleman suggested, the time should come when beaver are raised in captivity they would come within the provisions of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will reject the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) All the functions of the Secretary of the Interior and the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, which affect the breeding, raising, producing, marketing, or any other phase of the production or distribution, of domestically raised fur-bearing animals, or products thereof, are hereby transferred to and vested in the Secretary of Agriculture.

(b) Appropriations and unexpended balances of appropriations, or parts thereof, which the Director of the Budget determines to be available for expenditure for the administration of any function transferred by this act, shall be available for expenditure for the continued administration of such function by the officer to whom such function is so transferred.

(c) All records and property (including office furniture and equipment) under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior used primarily in connection with the administration of functions transferred by this act are hereby transferred to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect 60 days after the date of its enactment.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. COOPER] having assumed the Chair, Mr. OUTLAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2115) relating to the domestic raising of fur-bearing animals, pursuant to House Resolution 544, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5671) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr.

RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, and Mr. DIRKSEN.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIRKSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record in two different instances.

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a letter.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the Record immediately following the address of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN], who has a special order this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, Maj. John R. Walsh, former Chief of the Intelligence Branch of the Persian Gulf Command of the United States Army, is writing a series of six articles, which are being carried in the Washington Post, on the disturbing situation in the Middle East. The first of these articles appeared in the Washington Post on March 17, entitled "Russian Aims in Middle East Are Revealed by Old Events." I think this historical background should be of very great interest to the people of this country, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include this article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE SUGAR SITUATION

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, a number of persons have spoken or written to me in reference to the shortage of sugar prevailing throughout the United States. I think perhaps I have been an object of special attention due to the fact that I am from Louisiana, a sugar-producing State. I do not, however, represent an area which grows sugarcane or produces beet sugar, but I have made, to some extent, a study of this situation. The statement I make today is in an effort to clear up the reasons for the shortage of this universal household commodity.

There are certain definite reasons for our shortage of sugar today, none of which is connected with Government operation. I believe that the Members of Congress and the people of the United States are entitled to know these reasons; and if you will give me your attention for a few minutes, I will quickly outline them and explain in detail as far as my time will allow.

In the first place, sugar could not suddenly become plentiful, like gasoline and steel, when the war ended. Peace brought no relief to this problem because the sugar backlog usually stored up in this country was all gone, sources of supply lost, and it takes months to plant and harvest the cane and beet crops. To

increase processing facilities it takes even longer, especially with existing shortages of essential material.

Before the war, we consumed in the United States about 6,000,000 tons of sugar a year. That means a little more than 100 pounds per person per year. We obtained this sugar from the following sources of supply before the war:

	Tons
Cuba.....	1,950,000
United States beets.....	1,000,000
Philippine Islands.....	1,000,000
Hawaii.....	950,000
Puerto Rico.....	600,000
United States cane.....	400,000
Miscellaneous.....	50,000

New what has happened to our sources of sugar? Where has it gone? Why are we short today? Here is the answer, briefly stated, so that everyone in the United States can fully understand:

In the first place, the Philippine supply of 1,000,000 tons was completely and suddenly shut off on Pearl Harbor day and we have had nothing since. Reports tell us that we can expect no sugar from the Philippines for another 2 years. Many of the mills are damaged or destroyed, no crops have been planted, and the outlook is very discouraging.

The next largest loss in our supplies came from beet production in our own country. This area normally produced about 23 percent of our prewar sugar consumption. During the war, sugar-beet growers were faced with a shortage of labor. It is well known that the sugar beet is one of the heaviest labor crops on the farm. Naturally, faced with a shortage of labor, the farmer preferred to plant crops where the labor requirement was less. Also, other foodstuffs were needed as well as sugar beets. Many farmers diverted beet acreage to other crops and it is difficult to say that they did not contribute just as much to the war effort by producing beans, potatoes, and so forth, as they would have had they produced sugar beets. In my section, many farmers went into the cattle-raising business. The farmers lost a large proportion of their young men to the armed forces and other. entered the war industries, such as shipyards, airplane factories, and others.

Puerto Rico suffered in 1943 and 1944 through a drought and our inability to ship fertilizer to the island in 1942 and 1943, due to a shortage of shipping. The 1946 Puerto Rican crop should be back to prewar levels or even better.

Hawaiian sugar producers had cane fields requisitioned by the armed forces and converted into airports. Mechanized equipment was requisitioned. Labor was lost to the armed forces and to defense work in the islands. Despite this, their production dropped less than 15 percent from prewar levels.

Louisiana and Florida cane production has fluctuated at around or better than prewar volume. I am proud to say that the growers in these areas have made valiant efforts to increase production but have also been hindered by insufficient labor. The production in Louisiana has been increased, however, almost one-quarter, I am told, above prewar production.

Cuba has been our principal source of supply during the war and has been able to increase its production substantially. During the war years Cuba cooperated by selling its crop to us at reasonable prices. The 1945 crop outturned about three-quarters of a million tons less than had been expected, due to a hurricane and severe drought which reduced the crop. Although negotiations for the 1946 Cuban purchase have been more difficult, because of certain demands being made by Cuba as to its future share in the United States market, nevertheless, a contract is ultimately expected to be concluded. In the meanwhile, shipments of new-crop Cuban sugar are coming forward on an agreement, and the lack of a final contract is not affecting our supplies.

Although production in all areas during 1946 will substantially exceed the production of 1945, there will not be any more sugar actually available due to the fact that stocks in the United States and its supplying areas on January 1, 1946, were about 400,000 tons less than January 1, 1945. Stocks are now at a minimum and consumption must come from production.

Many remarks have been made on the floor of this House recently charging bungling and mismanagement by the Department of Agriculture of the sugar problem. It was recently stated that the Government price-fixers have used the excuse in 1943 and 1944 that the dire shortage was due to lack of ships to bring sugar from Cuba and that this statement was not true. The statement is 100-percent correct as, during those years, there was always extra sugar available in Cuba but, due to severe losses in shipping tonnage by submarine activity and the requisitioning of further tonnage for military purposes, there were so few ships available to move sugar from Cuba that it was necessary to inaugurate a so-called ferry system of moving sugar from Habana by barges and tugs to Florida ports and the shipment of sugar from there by rail to United States consuming areas.

It has also been stated that millions of pounds of sugar went to waste in Cuba. This is also incorrect. No sugar went to waste in Cuba although it is true that during the years of shipping stringency a limited amount of blackstrap molasses had to be ditched as further storage space was not available. This product is a byproduct of sugar manufacture. It should be remembered that in that period tank steamers were at a premium and those available had to be used for the movement of petroleum products to our armed forces and our allies.

It has also been stated that there has been recent delay in shipment of sugar from Cuba due to the insistence by the Commodity Credit Corporation that it would pay only 3.10 cents per pound for 47,500 tons of 1946-crop sugar to be shipped as replacement of a similar quantity of 1945-crop sugar loaned by Commodity Credit Corporation to Cuba for local consumption needs. I am sure that no reasonable person would dispute the issue with Commodity Credit Corporation when it is known that the purchase price of sugar loaned to Cuba was 3.10 cents

and that, certainly, the Cuban Government should return it at the same price despite the fact that the price for 1946 sugar is 3.675 cents per pound. There has been no disagreement with the Cuban Government on this point.

It has also been stated that Great Britain is offering Cuba 9 cents per pound for sugar, and that this act has some bearing on our difficulties with Cuba. The truth of the matter is that Great Britain has not offered any price to Cuba but will share in our purchase under the recommended allocations of the Combined Food Board, as has been the case in each of the war years.

Now, let me discuss the second large group of fundamental reasons for our sugar shortage. I refer to the great increase of nonfood uses of sugar. For the first time in the history of our country sugar went to war for other purposes besides food.

These new nonfood uses made great inroads in our sugar supplies. From 1942 to 1945, inclusive, 1,600,000 tons of sugar were converted into an invert sirup to be used for the production of industrial alcohol for the rubber and explosives programs.

During the war all the sugar we could lay our hands on was subject to allocation by the Combined Food Board. This meant that we could not take for ourselves all the sugar that we could find. This Board allocated a fair percentage to our allies, especially Russia and England. Next, lend-lease got its share of the total and UNRRA now is being taken care of.

Our prewar average consumption in this country was about 100 pounds per person per year, but the armed forces jumped this to almost 150 pounds per soldier and sailor. With all of these situations developing, it is a wonder that our people were provided for as well as they were in regard to sugar. Again, let me call attention to the fact that the reasons I have given in the second group for our shortage of sugar were not caused by any of the agencies of Government.

There has been exceedingly close cooperation between most of the units of the sugar industry, including the Cuban Sugar Stabilization Institute, and the Department of Agriculture. I have mentioned the problems of the producing areas and I might add at this point that the cane-sugar refiners on the east, Gulf, and west coasts also suffered with labor problems and irregularities of ship arrivals as well as wartime regulations and handicaps, but, in spite of these handicaps, managed to handle the raw sugar supplies from offshore areas so as to assure a reasonably steady flow of refined sugar to the consumers of this country. At present, the amount of sugar available for consumers in the United States is less than 70 percent of their prewar use. We are now in the period of greatest crises in sugar supplies, but the prospects are for a gradual but steady improvement in the situation.

Naturally, there have been complaints about insufficient supplies of sugar, charges of mismanagement and bungling and, unquestionably, mistakes have been made; but where programs are so large,

so complicated, and so difficult of administration, it is not strange that some mistakes have been made. The Department of Agriculture has had to face a most difficult job in trying to obtain by production and assembly the tremendous tonnage of sugar needed by our people. Perhaps no other work in the agricultural field has been as complicated and as difficult as has been this program; and we who sit here in this House of Representatives should know and understand some of the problems which vexed the Department of Agriculture in its long and hard struggle for badly needed sugar supplies.

I do not wish to conclude without saying a word on behalf of our good friend and former colleague, the Secretary of Agriculture, Clint Anderson. He is devoting himself to his duties as a member of the Cabinet with the same sincerity, diligence, and drive which was characteristic of his work here as a Member of the House of Representatives. I have met him a number of times since he has become a member of the Cabinet; and I believe the country and this Congress appreciate the fact that he is setting a magnificent example of industry and sincerity in high Government position during this most critical period of reconversion.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Louisiana.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Notwithstanding these various severe handicaps the farmers of the country were faced with, I think the gentleman would like to know that Louisiana increased its prewar production of sugar over 25 percent during the war period.

Mr. BROOKS. I think the gentleman from Louisiana will fully agree with me that they are entitled to the applause and commendation of the country for the magnificent effort they made in spite of these handicaps.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to my distinguished friend from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I just wanted to say that I feel certain the House will appreciate the contribution being made by the gentleman from Louisiana in clearing up some of the misapprehensions in connection with the sugar situation.

I also have had some letters, but I have not been able to answer them as accurately as I feel I can after the gentleman has concluded his very fine statement.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I wish also to express my appreciation for the information that the gentleman has brought to the House.

What is the total consumption of this country normally?

Mr. BROOKS. Normally, about a hundred pounds per person per annum.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And what is our production annually, normally?

Mr. BROOKS. For the entire country?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. For the entire country, and you might include our possessions.

Mr. BROOKS. I think our production would normally be about the same as the figures I have given.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. How much are we short in our production as compared with our needs?

Mr. BROOKS. Our shortage is due to a number of things.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I know, but I say, normally, how much are we short?

Mr. BROOKS. We are at the lowest ebb in sugar stocks now.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman does not understand my question. How much do our consumptive needs exceed our production?

Mr. BROOKS. I do not have the exact information which the gentleman wants. The difficulty there is that if we do obtain more sugar we are in a situation where others are stripped of sugar likewise. The over-all picture is not particularly attractive to our present needs.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I was not making any effort to question the gentleman's statement at all, but I was asking, for my own information, how much we were usually short in our production over our consumption.

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to my good friend from Louisiana who represents the Sugar Bowl of the State of Louisiana.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I have been through that and was very, very much impressed.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. The production of sugarcane in the United States, which is largely centered in Florida and Louisiana, reaches about a million tons of sugar per year, which is about 15 percent of the entire production. The beet-producing section of this country produces about 22 percent. That would give approximately 37 percent of the consumption.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What I was trying to get at was how much we depend upon foreign countries for our sugar.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Our production is about 37 percent, normally, of our consumption. So the difference would be the percentage we would be dependent upon other countries for.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. You have not included in that our foreign possessions, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. The Philippines produce about 800,000 tons of sugar yearly.

Mr. BROOKS. We are certainly short from the Philippine Islands. That constitutes the bulk of what we are short.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What I was trying to get at is how much we have to get from other countries in normal times.

Mr. BROOKS. That is just what I have told the gentleman. In normal times we get close to a million tons from the Philippine Islands.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. But that is our own possessions. I was trying to find out what tonnage we were dependent upon other countries for.

Mr. BROOKS. In normal times we get our sugar from Cuba and Puerto Rico and the other sources which I mentioned, which are either ours or very close to this country.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I think the gentleman is making an excellent statement. He is explaining the reasons why this shortage exists. They are facts that are generally known. But what the gentleman does not quite realize is that there was a material reduction in beet sugar in this country, because the beet farmers went into other agricultural products. They did this because they could not make any money out of the price-fixing policy of the OPA and the policies of the Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, are there other special orders? I should like a little more time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is one other special order.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the gentleman's having additional time.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. The gentleman must realize that sugar is the only commodity in the entire price-fixing field where no increase of price was authorized prior to February of this year. That necessarily discouraged the domestic producers of sugar in this country and they went into other agricultural pursuits, if they could. In Louisiana there is an enormous investment of capital in sugar factories. The type of farming that prevails in that particular area is not adaptable to anything else than the growing of sugarcane.

May I also call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that there are 5 sugar factories in the State of Louisiana that went out of the production of raw sugar and went into the production of molasses because of the arbitrary and confiscatory prices of the OPA and the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BROOKS. Let me suggest to the gentleman that he take his own time and allude to the problems and troubles he has mentioned in that respect, because that is far afield from the subject of the speech I made here.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman think for a minute that Mr. Anderson, our present Secretary of Agriculture, would do the same as a previous Secretary of Agriculture did when he cut the production of sugar in Louisiana and in Florida, doing away with the planting of a lot of sugarcane, yet at the same time we paid the sugar industry \$78,000,000

for not raising sugar? When they started that policy in our Government a few years ago does the gentleman believe it led to anything but chaos in the sugar and other industries?

Mr. BROOKS. I know what the gentleman is referring to. I made no mention of that in the course of my remarks. I reiterate that the present Secretary of Agriculture is doing a magnificent job; he is setting an example of sincerity of purpose and honesty of endeavor to the entire country that we ought to be proud of.

Mr. RICH. I am in sympathy with what Mr. Anderson is doing, but I was opposed to what a previous Secretary of Agriculture did about 10 years ago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has again expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, over on the other side of the Capitol, Senate bill 1349 is now being debated, considered, and amendments are being offered. This bill, of course, originated in the Senate and will not come to the House until that body has acted.

Senate bill 1349 amends the Fair Labor Standards Act, raises the 40-cent minimum hourly wage to 65 cents for the first year beginning 120 days after the bill becomes law. This is raised to 70 cents the second year and 75 cents thereafter. The bill also provides that upon recommendation of an Industry Advisory Committee and after hearing interested parties, the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division may establish the 75-cent minimum for unskilled job classifications in a particular industry prior to the time prescribed by this act. He can also fix minimum rates higher than the 65-75-cent rate for job classifications other than unskilled in order to maintain reasonable wage differentials between the minimum for unskilled labor and the rates for interrelated job classifications within the industry. Overtime pay at time and a half will be based on the new wage rates, and on a 40-hour week. Employment of oppressive child labor by an employer engaged in interstate commerce or in the production of goods for such commerce is prohibited. Coverage is extended to include seamen and individuals within the area of production in handling, storing, canning, and so forth, of agricultural products for market or in making dairy products—amending United States Code 29: 202, 203, 206-208, 212, 213, 216. An action by an employee to recover liability for unpaid minimum wages or unpaid overtime compensation may be brought within 5 years after accrual of the liability.

Undoubtedly this bill will presently be before us. I have no quarrel whatever with a substantial minimum wage. Good wages and high production are clearly essential to the Nation's welfare and solvency. Nor do I find any wide-spread opposition from my district or region to this particular part of the proposal.

There are, however, other provisions in the act which regionally, climatically,

seasonally, and industrially are too inflexible. This is a clear instance of the difficulty of Federal applications of a problem that must be considered, always, from the viewpoint of local or regional influences.

Certainly any such amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act should allow for the maximum of flexibility if the merits of such a proposition are to be achieved. Certainly, to achieve such an objective, production must be encouraged and kept at the maximum. If wages, which must come from full production, are to be held at high levels, nothing should be permitted to creep in that will, through inept administration, paralyze production or create confusion. Initiative is certainly entitled to that assurance from us.

There are many sincere and well-informed men in industries throughout the Nation who should be fully heard before we in Congress write too many conclusions into such an act. If we want the purposes of such an act to be achieved, it should be the point of wisdom for us to listen to their advice.

It is, therefore, my pleasure to read you a letter I have just received from Mr. Frank W. Shields, of the Yakima Valley Traffic and Credit Association.

It is a most interesting letter and I believe it states the case of highly perishable commodities very well. This letter is in no sense an attack upon the principle of high wages. As the letter indicates, we rank well up in any class of wage scales for agricultural labor. It is, however, a forthright and clear appeal to the Congress not to enact any inflexible legislation that might in the end defeat the very purposes for which such an act was conceived and introduced.

The letter reads as follows:

YAKIMA VALLEY TRAFFIC &
CREDIT ASSOCIATION, INC.,
March 15, 1946.

HON. WALTER HORAN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HORAN: This letter is an appeal for consideration of an area having a population of 140,000 persons whose welfare is dependent on the successful growing and marketing of more than 20,000 carloads of tree fruits—peaches, pears, prunes, and apples. Moreover, it is an appeal for the special consideration of more than 5,000 orchardists, whose welfare is entirely dependent upon their ability to grow, harvest, and market their crops successfully.

The growing, harvesting, and preparing of a carload of fruit for market requires approximately 1,600 hours of hand labor. Between the tree and car, each individual piece of fruit must be handled several times before it comes to rest in packages ready for shipment. These operations are perforce seasonal, and because of the perishable nature of the product rapid handling is required from the moment the fruit is just right for harvesting. Thus many hands are required to perform this work within the seasonal limitation set by nature.

For example, if the 1945 cherry crop of this area had been laid end to end it would have paved a strip 1 foot wide reaching from Seattle to Chicago. Each cherry is handled individually three times—when it is picked from the tree, when it is sorted, and when it is put in the package. Moreover, this work must be done with dispatch or the fruit will lose its food value. Thus the harvesting and preparation of tree fruits must be timed to

the day and hour or else the whole system of production will fail.

An unseasonably hot day that accelerates the ripening of peaches, pears, prunes, a rain that starts rot in cherries, a frost that starts apples dropping to the ground overnight demands that the processes of harvesting and preparation of perishable products for market must be subject to adjustment to the needs of the product, else producers stand to lose their labor and investment, and the area's economy may be threatened.

Frequently, during the fruit season, the problem of timely harvesting and preparation of the area's products is compounded by reason of multiple crops maturing at one time. For example, production in Yakima County ranks first in apples, first in summer pears, first in cherries of 3,072 counties in the United States, and third in total value of its agricultural production.

In consequence of this, a wide latitude on hours of employment is essential to the harvesting and preparation of these crops for market. Ordinarily, 20,000 temporary workers must be brought into the district to supplement resident workers. Even then it is not always possible to avoid a partial loss of crops.

For example, in 1944 the area lost Earllett pears having a value of more than \$1,000,000 because of insufficient labor to handle them timely.

In addition to the acreage already in production in this area, 72,000 acres of additional land in the Roza project is now coming into production, and soon 1,000,000 acres of the Columbia Basin project will be added to this area, which will greatly increase the area's labor load.

The crops produced in this area cannot be harvested and prepared for market pursuant to predetermined production schedules, as is the case of continuing industrial processes, because hours of work are fixed by the unyielding and capricious laws of nature. It is not a problem that can be conformed to social desirability. We grant the desirability of shorter hour work days and work weeks. But the choice which governs the area's operation is the one of conforming the operation to the laws of nature and the resultant maximizing of the Nation's food supply, or the one of restricting production and minimizing food volume, not to mention the loss of wages to workers if production were to be minimized.

The problem of the worker in this entire area has never yet caused governmental concern. The average agricultural wage paid by our farmers in 1944 and 1945 averaged \$9.40 per day, the highest agricultural wage paid anywhere in the United States. When it is considered that the area's products must be transported largely to the markets of the East, Southeast, and South at high freight rates, and sold for what they will bring in competition with the products of areas not so handicapped—wage rates for this area are exceptional.

In the packing plants of the area, wages are influenced by wages on the farms and generally average 10 to 25 cents an hour more than wages on the farm. Historically, this has been the rule. Moreover, wage rates in the plants are determined by management-union agreement. The unions are recognized by management as the bargaining agents for all plant employees, union or non-union.

Although there are periods when workers must work long hours per day as well as long hours a week, fruit workers generally work a maximum of not more than 9 months out of each year. The high rate of pay which prevails in the area makes the 9 months' employment attractive to workers generally despite the longer day and week hours during rush periods.

Moreover, a different social and economic problem is presented relative to the employment of fruit workers in this area than is the situation where the help works the year around as in factories, stores, or other non-essential establishments. Consequently, hours of labor and working conditions are very much less related to their health and morals than is the case of year-around workers in certain other occupations.

Because of the area's unusual labor requirements, the perishability of our products, and the necessity of preparing for market a large proportion of these products in plants off the farm, the Government a number of years ago set up exceptions in the law (section 7 (b) (3), section 7 (c), section 13 (a) (10), the Fair Labor Standards Act) to meet this particular agricultural need.

Perhaps no better authority can be quoted on this point than Secretary of Labor Schwellentach, known equally well in our State for his friendship to labor as well as his statesmanship. In his sponsorship of the exemption given agricultural employment within the area of production under the Fair Labor Standards Act he said, "The purpose of the amendment is not for the protection of the packing plants nor the owners of packing plants. The cost is paid by the producer. These packing plants just pass the cost back to the man who produces the apples. The farmer pays the bill. The purpose of the amendment is to permit the small farmer who cannot afford to have his own warehouse and cannot afford to have his own washing machine, to be placed on a parity with larger producers who can afford to maintain their own warehouses and their own washing machines and their own equipment."

It is because the work of preparing fresh fruits and vegetables in their raw or natural state is essentially agricultural and the costs paid by the producer, no matter who performs them that as a national policy Congress has wisely granted broad latitude and exemption on matters of wages and hours:

The Fair Labor Standards Act provides three exemptions for the preparation of perishable fruits and vegetables:

Section 7 (b) (3): No overtime for a period of 14 weeks until beyond 12 hours per day and 56 hours per week because of seasonal character.

Section 7 (c): Total exemption for a period of 14 weeks from the hour provisions in the first processing, canning, or packing perishable or seasonal fresh fruits and vegetables.

Section 13 (a) (10): Total exemption withing the area of production from both the wage-and-hour provisions of the law for anyone employed in the handling, packing, storing, drying, or preparing in their raw or natural state of agricultural or horticultural commodities for market.

Historically, the area consistently has had to take full advantage of the exceptions provided for agricultural labor in the present Fair Labor Standards Act. There is no reason to believe that the farmers, packers, and workers can harvest and prepare a constantly increasing production in fewer hours of work days and work weeks than they have been able to handle the production of the past.

Consequently, the Pepper amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act which drops exceptions section 7 (b) (3), section 7 (c), and section 13 (c) (10) will, if adopted in its present form, provide a real threat to the farmers of this area, to the general economy of all people residing in the area as well as the Nation's food supply.

It is, therefore, submitted that hours of work and working conditions in the harvesting and packing of fresh fruits for market must be handled very differently than other nonseasonal industries for the following reasons:

1. Nature regulates the ripening of fresh fruits and, therefore, dictates the intermittent harvesting and packing operations of them. For example, the maximum time a grower has to harvest a crop of peaches, cherries, apricots, prunes, or summer pears is about 10 days and during a time of extremely hot weather; this time is reduced to as low as 5 days. In order that these fruits be maintained in suitable condition for shipment to market, the packing houses must handle them within a day from the time they are harvested.

2. This seasonal employment for brief periods of time performed by fruit workers during which they must work more day and week hours than necessary in industrial plants do not pose a problem relative to health and morals of such workers as would employment of them in a nonseasonal industry.

3. Extra night shifts are definitely impractical and generally impossible.

4. Restrictions incompatible with seasonality of the operations would cause a severe loss of the Nation's food supply.

In consequence of the foregoing statement we are requesting that you use your efforts to have the exceptions, as contained in the present Fair Labor Standards Act, incorporated in the proposed Pepper amendment to the act.

Unless this is done there is every reason to believe that the Pepper amendment will make it impossible for the highly specialized agricultural operation of this area to prosper—it might not even be able to exist at all.

For this year and regardless of the needs of farmers and workers, the changing of any regulation that may result in an impairment of the Nation's food supply is unthinkable. Authoritative observers of worldwide conditions state that more people will die from sheer starvation during the coming year than in the past 150 years. This prospect alone should serve to stay any action on legislation that may reduce our critical food supply.

We trust that our plea for the agricultural interests of this area will have your utmost consideration.

Yours very truly,

YAKIMA VALLEY TRAFFIC &

CREDIT ASSOCIATION,

By FRANK W. SHIELDS,

Secretary-Manager.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman is rendering a service in calling attention to the possible dangers involved in inflexible provisions governing minimum wages. I know of his interest in improving the condition of the workers for whom this legislation is advanced. I feel as he does however that legislation of this kind should be very cautiously approached, not because we are unwilling for a reasonable advancement to be made since changing conditions might require some changes in legislation of this type, but if I interpret the gentleman's point of view correctly, two things must be insisted upon: first, that the regional disparities be properly considered, and second, that this legislation not have an inflationary effect. We do not help the condition of the workers of America by cutting off the employment of those who cannot earn an inordinately high minimum wage and withholding, as a result of that, the goods that would come from the factories where they might be employed. Without prejudging the case, I join in the warning that has been sounded by the

gentleman from Washington and suggest that the condition of little businesses employing millions of workers affected by this legislation be adequately considered in approaching an important program of this kind. I thank the gentleman for calling it to our attention.

Mr. HORAN. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Arkansas. It is going to take a real working combination of initiation and sweat to get this country back in the groove of full production. Anything we might do unwisely here to frustrate initiative at the production end should be avoided if possible.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct the attention of the House to one of the most vital problems before our Nation today. I refer to the need for legislation raising the minimum wage for low-paid American workers in American industry. As you know, there are numerous House bills which propose to raise the minimum wage to a point which will more nearly provide a minimum of adequacy for the wage earners of America who are engaged in interstate commerce. And at this moment, the Senate is considering S. 1349, which among other things, proposes to raise the minimum wage under the Fair Labor Standards Act to 65 cents.

It is a matter of urgency that the Labor Committee of the House, which has heard testimony on these bills, bring the question before the House at the earliest possible moment. In this reconversion period, when wages of many workers are being set by collective bargaining, we must see to it that those weak in bargaining power, those who would be primarily affected by the proposal to establish a more adequate floor under wages, should receive this congressional guarantee of a decent wage before they are forgotten in the self-interest of those who think only in terms of profits.

As one who prides himself in seeking legislation which is in the interest of the people as a whole, I strongly favor raising the minimum wage to 65 cents and I feel certain that a majority of the people in my State are equally as strong in support of the proposal.

Raising the minimum wage at this time would add millions of dollars to the purchasing power of low-paid industrial workers, and a great proportion of this increased income would go toward assuring a better and broader market for the American farmer.

Raising the minimum wage to 65 cents an hour would not affect prices materially since in practically all industries the added cost can be readily borne out of profits and increased productivity of better-nourished, better-housed, and more contented workers.

The minimum wage should be raised in order to assure jobs to our returning veterans, jobs which will provide enough income to guarantee adequate diet, adequate shelter, and the general well-being of the fighting men on whom we were so recently depending to win these very cherished privileges and necessities.

Furthermore, the minimum wage must be raised in accordance with the principles and ideals on which this Nation was founded. America can ill afford to carry

on business as usual while many millions of her people are being paid wages which will not provide a minimum standard of living; America, I contend, can ill afford to subsidize the business activities of her industrial giants at the expense of the ill-fed, the ill-clothed, and the ill-housed, low-paid worker.

We in the North very smugly think that the South is the only low-range area. But there are too many such industries and areas in the North and in Indiana also. Recently such a case was laid bare in Indiana, the case of the Indiana Cotton Mills, Inc., of Cannelton, Ind., in my own Eighth District.

No doubt the average well-informed person would assume that no such wages as 48 cents an hour would be paid in any fairly large manufacturing plant in Indiana. However, an initial examination into the wage structure of the above plant by the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, indicates that there are 350 workers in this plant—a typical cotton mill. Wages to learners now are 45 cents an hour, but until recently were less than 40 cents. The so-called plant minimum—the least any permanent worker is supposed to be paid—is 48 cents per hour. However, the actual average hourly wage is 53 cents. Weekly pay is therefore less than \$21.20 for 40 hours, which is what most cotton mills are running.

This demonstrates the existence of a little-known fact that in every so-called high-wage area, we constantly run into pockets of very low, really sweat shop, wages.

I think I speak for the people of Indiana when I say that I strongly favor the minimum-wage legislation now before the Senate and which has been the subject of weeks of testimony before the House Labor Committee. I favor this proposed 65-cent minimum wage legislation because it is in the interest of all of the people of Indiana—because it is a proposal which would benefit hundreds of thousands of people in my State and throughout the Union.

There is nothing complicated about the proposal; there is nothing complicated concerning the real issues involved; these bills, in the House, and Senate bill 1349, simply aim to provide enough food, and clothing and adequate shelter to afford a minimum level of decency for millions of low-paid American wage earners.

As a representative of the people of my State, I want to reiterate my strong support of this proposal to raise the minimum wage to 65 cents an hour and I trust that as the other body considers this proposal that the State's representatives there will likewise support and vote for this legislation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a letter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WASIELEWSKI, for today and tomorrow, on account of official business.

To Mr. HOCH, for Wednesday, March 20, on account of official business.

To Mr. COLMER (at the request of Mr. RICHARDS), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1354. An act to authorize the permanent appointment in the grades of General of the Army, Fleet Admiral of the United States Navy, general in the Marine Corps, and admiral in the Coast Guard, respectively, of certain individuals who have served in such grades during the Second World War.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 21, 1946, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1152. A letter from the director, national legislative committee, the American Legion, transmitting the proceedings of the Twenty-seventh Annual National Convention of the American Legion, held at Chicago, Ill., November 18 to 21, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 512); to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1153. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting report of its activities and expenditures for the month of October 1945; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1154. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting report covering its operations for the period from the organization of the Corporation on February 2, 1932, to September 30, 1945, inclusive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation submits a report pursuant to House Resolution 192 on Investigation of the Veterans' Administration (Rept. No. 1795). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress. H. R. 5644. A bill to facilitate voting by members of the armed forces and certain others absent from the place of their residence, and to amend Public Law 712, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 1796). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 5828. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the complete independence of the Philippine Islands, to

provide for the adoption of a constitution and a form of government for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," as amended; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 5829. A bill to amend the act of May 22, 1896, so as to include posts of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 5830. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the unauthorized wearing, manufacture, or sale of medals and badges awarded by the War Department," as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 5831. A bill to include the heads of executive departments and independent agencies within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 5832. A bill providing for the conveyance to the town of Marblehead in the State of Massachusetts, of Marblehead Military Reservation for public use; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 5833. A bill to increase the compensation of postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 5834. A bill to amend an act to provide compensation for disability or death resulting from injury to employees in certain maritime employments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 5835. A bill authorizing the Director of the National Park Service to erect headstones for sailors who were buried at sea; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. Con. Res. 137. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President of the United States invite Premier Stalin to a conference for the purpose of discussing international affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. R. 5836. A bill granting a renewal of patent No. 1046196 issued December 3, 1912, for device known as a smoke consumer; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 5837. A bill for the relief of Vivian Newell Price; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana:

H. R. 5838. A bill for the relief of Pearle Hoen; to the Committee on Claims.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 21, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou hast created us in Thine own image and with a capacity to be like Thee in mind and in spirit.

Grant that during this day we may yield ourselves gladly and unreservedly to the pulsations of the higher life. Make us responsive to the persuasions of those ideals which Thou hast implanted within our souls.

We pray that our President and all who share in the responsibilities of government may be blessed with an ever-increasing measure of Thy guiding and sustaining spirit. In the midst of the world's trials and tribulations, may they be men of clear and commanding vision and dauntless and indomitable valor.

Inspire us with fidelity and fortitude as we seek to build a civilization for the glory of God and the welfare of mankind everywhere. Help us to live out each day in faith, in faithfulness, and in the fear of the Lord.

Hear us in the name of the Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, March 20, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1821) to amend section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, so as to authorize the appropriation of funds necessary to provide additional temporary housing units for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. LANHAM, Mr. BELL, Mr. BOYKIN, Mr. MCGREGOR, and Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5671) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, and Mr. DIRKSEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 243) tendering the thanks of Congress to General of the Army George C. Marshall and the members of the Army of the United States who have fought